Grievous Wolf's 'Errors' and 'Archaisms' in the 1611 Holy Bible

Introduction

Grievous Wolf has posed 67 i.e. 103 bogus questions against the 1611 Holy Bible, all of which have been explicitly answered.

See www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/james-white-dr-divietro-and-dawaite.php, *Answers to the Wolf-Man*.

In addition to posing bogus questions *against* the 1611 Holy Bible, Wolf also purports to have found numerous 'errors' and 'archaisms' *in* the 1611 Holy Bible.

These so-called 'errors' and 'archaisms' in ***"the scripture of truth"*** Daniel 10:21, the 1611 Holy Bible, have been copied from Grievous Wolf's site.

See www.cerm.info/bible_studies/Exegetical/king_james_onlyism.htm.

They may be found in the **Appendix** to this work. The verses that Grievous declares to be in error are listed under *Question 31* of *Answers to the Wolf-Man*.

This work is a Biblical response to Grievous Wolf's so-called 'errors' and 'archaisms' in ***"the scripture of truth"*** Daniel 10:21, the 1611 Holy Bible. The so-called 'errors' and 'archaisms' will be listed in turn as they are encountered on Wolf's site and answered in turn.

Note finally that Wolf's attacks on ***"the scripture of truth"*** Daniel 10:21 that follow are all superficial. He substantiates nothing.

Wolf's 'Chart' of Supposed Mistranslations in the AV1611

See the **Appendix** for Wolf's bogus 'chart.' He obtained it from the same anti-Biblical site www.bible.ca/b-kjv-only.htm#questions that he extracted his 67 i.e. 103 questions from, the original list containing a further two questions that Grievous Wolf did not see fit to use. See *Answers to the Wolf-Man*.

It is noteworthy that Grievous Wolf draws attention to the different editions of the 1611 Holy Bible in his very first question. See *Answers to the Wolf-Man*. However, he refers in his chart to the Textus Receptus as though it is a single document. He fails to mention that several editors compiled numerous editions of the Textus Receptus, namely those of Erasmus, Stephanus, Beza, Elzevir, that differ from each other. See *Hazardous Materials* by Dr Mrs Gail Riplinger, Chapters 18, 19. In turn, Grievous Wolf fails to mention which edition of the Textus Receptus he is using in his chart and why it is sufficiently authoritative to supposedly 'correct' the 1611 Holy Bible.

That failure on Wolf's part is all the more serious because in his list of questions, he eventually states that even the Textus Receptus (edition unspecified) is not itself error-free, although he begins by implying that it *is*. See *Answers to the Wolf-Man*, *Questions 1*, *15*, *16*, *25*. Grievous Wolf does not appear to be of particularly ***"sound mind"*** therefore but instead seems to be languishing among ***"those that oppose themselves"*** 2 Timothy 1:7, 2:25.

It should also be noted that Wolf lists numerous Old Testament verses in his chart; Isaiah 14:12, 1 Samuel 10:24, 2 Samuel 16:16, 1 Kings 1:25, Leviticus 6:21, 8:28, 17:6, 23:18, 1 Kings 20:38 in the order in which they appear in the chart. If Wolf seeks to be precise with his supposed 'corrections' to the 1611 Holy Bible, he should at least distinguish between New Testament sources, to which the term Textus Receptus strictly applies, see *In Awe of Thy Word* by Dr Mrs Riplinger, Chapter 27 *The Received Text & Erasmus* and Old Testament sources, such as the editions of the Hebrew Massoretic Text.

Note that like the New Testament Received Texts, the extant editions of the Hebrew Old Testament Massoretic Text differ from each other, not greatly but still appreciably. See *Hazardous Materials* Chapters 27, 28, 29.

It is therefore significant that no 'originals-onlyist' has as yet come forth to state *unequivocally* that a *particular* Hebrew Old Testament edition and a *particular* Greek New Testament edition *together constitute* ***"all scripture"*** that ***"is given by inspiration of God"*** 2 Timothy 3:16, *each between two covers* and together *finally authoritative in all matters of faith and practice*.

Grievous Wolf is no exception, even eventually declaring that what he terms the 'Textus Receptus' has errors. See remarks above with respect to *Answers to the Wolf-Man, Questions 1, 15, 16, 25*.

Typically for an 'originals-onlyist,' Grievous Wolf is unable to specify *any* Greek New Testament text, Received or otherwise, that is *not* what he terms *"error free."* See related remarks above.

Likewise typically for an 'originals-onlyist,' Grievous Wolf has no single final authority between two covers for his opposition to the 1611 Holy Bible but instead, like James White in *The King James Only Controversy* p 7, recommends *"multiple translations"* and urges the use of available software for this purpose. See **Appendix** for his comments under Exodus 20:13.

'Originals-onlyists' like White, Wolf et al are not missionary-minded, as Sister Riplinger reveals[1].

"It is scandalous for rich Americans to have ten versions of the bible, instead of just one...Many tribes and peoples around the world have no King James Bible type bibles at all; the Albanian bible was destroyed during the communist regime. Many of the tribes in New Guinea do not have a bible in their language. But, these countries have no money to pay the publishers. The publishers are not interested in giving these people bibles; they are just interested in making bibles that can produce a profit for their operation."

It will also be noted that Wolf substantiates nothing in his chart with respect to his supposed 'corrections' to the 1611 Holy Bible, which is also typical of an 'originals-onlyist.'

Proverbs 26:24 well describes Grievous Wolf, therefore, in his hatred for the 1611 Holy Bible.

"<u>He that hateth dissembleth with his lips</u>, <u>and layeth up deceit within him</u>;"

Wolf's Charted 'Mistranslations,' Verse by Verse

<u>Acts 19:37</u> ***"churches"***

Grievous Wolf states *"Every known Greek manuscript has HIEROSULOUS, "robbers of temples""*

In answer to arch-Bible critic James White, who has the same objection to Acts 19:37 that Wolf has, Dr Ruckman writes[2] with respect to Acts 19:37, his emphases, *"Here, the Greek word for "temples," found in all "text-types" and "families," has been "mistranslated" by the king's men (1611) as "churches," instead of "temples." This is an error, according to Jimbo. However! Such translation is* ***not*** *an error in the NIV, that Jimbo recommends. Scores of times, in the NIV, this type of dynamic equivalence is used…*

"The passages are Matthew 6:22, John 1:16, 6:27, 14:30, Acts 26:20, Romans 1:3, 2:17, 6:4, 8:10, 1 Corinthians 2:4, 5:5, 7:4, 17, 11:19, 12:6, Galatians 2:17, 3:3, 10, 4:21, Ephesians 1:23, 2:3, 4:2, 7, 17, 5:3, Colossians 2:3, 3:14 etc…

"No translating committee on earth (for 400 years) [has] ever translated every Greek word (from any text) ***exactly*** *according to its lexicography (dictionary meaning) as given in a Greek lexicon. All translators "take liberties" in order to get across what* ***they*** *think the meaning should be in their language…*

"Why did [White] allow [the NASV and the NIV] "affirmative action liberties" which he denied to the AV? I will tell you why: a vicious, irrational, Satanic prejudice against the greatest book that ever showed up on this planet. Consider:

"When the King's men substituted "churches" for "temples," they had just translated the "hieron" of "hierosulos" as "temple" more than fifty times in Matthew-Acts. They knew the root of the word was "temples." No ignorance was involved. James White pretended they erred through ignorance. He erred through ignorance…

"Jimbo's NIV had just committed this same dastardly "error" in the same chapter, for right at verses 39 and 41 we read "assembly" (NIV) for "church." But this word was "ekklesia." The NIV had just translated it as "church" (or "churches") twenty-two times in Matthew and Acts. Why? If "ecclesia" means "assembly" – and so the NIV and NASV translate it in Acts 19:32, 39, and 41 – what is this same word doing standing as "church" in the rest of the book of Acts and the Pauline Epistles?…

""Church" is a dynamic equivalent for "ecclesia." It is ***not*** *"formal equivalence." The AV translators WISELY chose – intentionally, with full knowledge – "churches" at Acts 19:37 to show you that the heathen who worship female goddesses (see the context!) not only have "temples," but "churches," as in St Peter, St Michael's, St Jude's, the Lateran, etc. They simply gave you an advanced revelation "not found in the original Greek"!*

"Poor old Jim White will die declaring the NIV can do things like that, but if the AV does it is an "error"…"

Grievous Wolf is of the same mind as James White, ***"men of corrupt minds, reprobate concerning the faith"*** 2 Timothy 3:8.

<u>*Isaiah 14:12*</u> ***"Lucifer"***

Grievous Wolf states *""O Day Star" (Lucifer is a human origin nickname for the Devil in the 1600's* [sic] *refers not to the devil but the king of Babylon)"*

Wolf's reference to ***"Lucifer"*** as a 17th century nickname of human origin is a lie. The *14th century* Wycliffe Bible has *"Lucifer"* in Isaiah 14:12.

The Bibles of the *16th century* English Protestant Reformation, Coverdale, Great, Bishops', Geneva all have *"Lucifer"* in Isaiah 14:12.

Wolf's reference to *"the king of Babylon"* is stupid. How does *"the king of Babylon"* come to be ***"fallen from heaven"*** as Isaiah 14:12 states? Grievous Wolf is unable to explain how.

Wolf's reading *"Day Star"* is in the margin of the AV1611 but it is in the text of the JB, NJB. Wolf evidently prefers the company of Rome.

Dr Mrs Riplinger[3] states, her emphases, *"Twentieth century versions have removed the name Lucifer, thereby eliminating the ONLY reference to him in the entire bible...The Hebrew is "helel, ben shachar," which is accurately translated,* ***"Lucifer, son of the morning."*** *The NIV...give(s) an English translation AS IF the Hebrew said, "shachar kokab, ben shachar"*

or "morning star, son of the morning (or dawn)". Yet the word for star (kobab) appears nowhere in the text. Also 'morning' appears only once, as the KJV shows, not twice as new versions indicate...

"The ultimate blasphemy occurs when the "morning star" takes "Lucifer's" place in Isaiah 14. Jesus Christ is the ***"morning star"*** *and is identified as such in Revelation 22:16, 2:28 and 2 Peter 1:19* [using the term ***"day star"***]. *With this [sleight] of hand switch, Satan not only slyly slips out of the picture but lives up to his name* ***"the accuser"*** *(Revelation 12:10) by attempting to make Jesus Christ the subject of the diatribe in Isaiah 14."*

Dr Mrs Riplinger notes that, *"the word kokab is translated as 'star' dozens of other times by NIV translators…New version editors know boger kokabis 'morning star' since it is used in Job 38:7. If God had intended to communicate 'morning star', he could have repeated it here. The word he chose, helel, appears nowhere else in the Old Testament, just as "Lucifer" appears nowhere else."*

That's exactly where Grievous Wolf's substitution of *"Day Star"* for ***"Lucifer"*** is, *"nowhere else"* but in the *margin* of the 1611 Holy Bible and, with only slight variation, in the *texts* of the Romish modern versions.

As indicated above, Grievous Wolf seems to prefer the company of Rome.

He should reflect upon Proverbs 13:20.

"He that walketh with wise men shall be wise: <u>but a companion of fools shall be destroyed</u>."

<u>Acts 12:4</u> ***"Easter"***

Grievous Wolf states *""Passover" (Easter very poor choice as it confuses the pagan origin Roman Catholic "Easter" holy day with what the TR clearly says is the Jewish Passover!)"*

The answer to Grievous Wolf has been taken from www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/why-the-av-only-7434.php, *Curley the Bible Corrector Part 2* with some added remarks or minor edits in braces [].

None of the critics can resist taking a swipe at ***"Easter"*** in Acts 12:4. The BT [Better Translation] commentator/critic of the Holy Bible is as ill-informed as the rest [like Grievous Wolf].

One conspicuously anti-1611 Holy Bible critic is James White, author of *The King James Only Controversy* [see remarks on Acts 19:37 above]. Homing in on Acts 12:4, he insists, pp 233-234, 241, by reference to the supposed popular perception of Easter, the writings of the secular historian Josephus with respect to Herod and the term the ***"feast of the Jews"*** in John 2:13; 2:23; 6:4, 11:55 that the term ***"Passover"*** includes ***"the days of unleavened bread"*** so that the term ***"Easter"*** cannot be justified on the basis that the Passover for that year was already past.

[White's criticism of ***"Easter"*** in Acts 12:4 goes further than Wolf's does but what follows answers both sets of criticisms. The essential point, as will be shown, is that Acts 12:4 must refer to ***"Easter,"*** not *"Passover"* and that ***"Passover"*** in the New Testament cannot and does not include ***"the days of unleavened bread."***]

Drs Gipp[4] Holland[5] and Moorman[6] have shown that all the critics, including James White, are wrong[7].

Dr Gipp states, his emphases, "The days of unleavened bread are NEVER referred to as the Passover. (It must be remembered that the angel of the Lord passed over Egypt on one night, not seven nights in a row…)

"Verse 3 shows that Peter was arrested during the days of unleavened bread (April 15-21). The Bible says: "Then were the days of unleavened bread." The Passover (April 14th) had already come and gone. Herod could not possibly have been referring to the Passover in his statement concerning Easter. The next Passover was a year away!"

[Dr Gipp corrects Wolf with respect to the origins of Easter, which predate Catholicism. *"Easter, as we know it, comes from the ancient pagan festival of Astarte. Also known as Ishtar (pronounced "Easter"). This festival has always been held late in the month of April. It was, in its original form, a celebration of the earth "regenerating" itself after the winter season."* Dr Gipp, his emphases, also explains the significance of Easter for Herod. *"Herod could not possibly have been referring to the passover in his statement concerning Easter. The next Passover was a **year away!** But the pagan holiday of Easter was just a **few days away**. Remember! Herod was a pagan Roman who worshipped the "queen of heaven". He was **NOT** a Jew. He had no reason to keep the Jewish Passover...In further considering Herod's position as a Roman, we must remember that the Herods were well known for celebrating (Matthew 14:6-11). In fact, in Matthew chapter 14 we see that a Herod was even willing to kill a man of God during one of his celebrations.*

*"It is elementary to see that Herod, in Acts 12, had arrested Peter during the days of unleavened bread, **after the passover**. The days of unleavened bread would end on the 21st of April. Shortly after that would come Herod's celebration of pagan Easter. Herod had not killed Peter during the days of unleavened bread simply because he wanted to wait until **Easter**. Since it is plain that both the Jews (Matthew 26:17-47) and the Romans (Matthew 14:6-11) would kill during a religious celebration, Herod's opinion seemed that he was not going to let the Jews "have all the fun." He would wait until his own pagan festival and see to it that Peter died in the excitement."*]

Note that Dr Gipp's books *The Answer Book, Gipp's Understandable History of the Bible,* one of the most extensive histories of the KJB in print and his booklet entitled *Answers to the Ravings of a Mad Plunger* that refutes a variety of basic objections to the KJB are all extremely helpful.

See Daystar Publishing, www.daystarpublishing.org/king-james-defense/.

Dr Holland states, in response to White, *"None of this deals with the fact that in Scripture Passover came before the Days of Unleavened Bread. In Mark 14:1 we read, "After two days was the feast of the passover, and of unleavened bread." Passover precedes the Days of Unleavened Bread even in the New Testament. None of the verses cited by White change this. In fact, three of them simply state that Passover was near (John 2:13; 6:4 and 11:55). John 2:23 speaks of many making a surface pretense of believing in Christ at the feast of the Passover. None of these verses show the two events as being called "Passover" as White states. As for Herod observing the Jewish feasts, this means little because as a politician he obeyed whatever was [convenient] for him while in political power, including both Jewish and Roman holidays. And, it should be remembered, that this "conspicuous observer of the Jewish customs and rituals" had just put James to death and was himself about to die by the hand of God for setting himself up as a god (Acts 12:21-23; Exodus 20:2-6)."*

Pastor Moorman states *"the word "passover" did not even exist before William Tyndale coined it for his Version of 1526-31. His was also the first English Bible to use "Easter.""*

[Pastor Moorman has these additional important comments. He notes *"Previously the Hebrew and Greek were left untranslated. For example, in Wycliffe's Bible***Error! Bookmark not defined.***, which was based on the Latin, we find pask or paske."* As Dr Ruckman points out, see below, any Greek text has *pascha*, *πάσχα* in Acts 12:4, the translation of which is not limited to *"passover"* and is not *"clearly...the Jewish Passover!"* because, as Dr Ruckman notes, today's Greeks use the word to refer to Easter! Pastor Moorman states *"It is precisely in this one passage that "Easter" must be used, and the translation "Passover" would have conflicted with the immediate context…the passage actually says: "…(Then were the days of unleavened bread)…intending after Easter to bring him forth to the people."*]

The critics do not mention that Tyndale's New Testament has the word *"Easter"* in Acts 12:4, even though Tyndale invented the word *"Passover."* Pastor Moorman continues, his under-linings.

"To begin with, the Passover occurred before the feast of unleavened bread [the actual feast begins on Nisan 15th], not after! "And in the fourteenth day of the first month is the passover of the LORD. And in the fifteenth day of this month is the feast: seven days shall unleavened bread be eaten." (Num. 28:16, 17)…

"Herod put Peter in Prison during the days of unleavened bread, and therefore after the Passover. The argument that the translation "Passover" should have been used as it is intended to refer to the entire period is ruled out by the inclusion of "these were the days of unleavened bread." Scripture does not use the word "Passover" to refer to the entire period (according to the first mention of the word *"passover"* in Exodus 12:11)."

Note also Numbers 33:3.

"And they departed from Rameses in the first month, on the fifteenth day of the first month; on the morrow after the passover the children of Israel went out with an high hand in the sight of all the Egyptians."

See also *Answers to Your Bible Version Questions* by David W. Daniels, Chick Publications, 2003, *The Book of Acts* by Dr Peter S. Ruckman, Bible Baptist Bookstore, pp 355-357 and the *Ruckman Reference Bible*, Bible Baptist Bookstore, 2009, p 1452. White is wrong with respect to Acts 12:4 and ***"Easter"*** and so are all the critics of the 1611 Holy Bible [Grievous Wolf included], 'the Greek' notwithstanding.

Matthew 3:7, 20:22 etc. ***"Baptism"***

Grievous Wolf gives Acts 2:38, 22:16 as the specific references for his objections to the word ***"baptism"*** after which he adds *"(entire New Testament)"* but he clearly did not check these verses, most likely because he simply copied them from the original site. The word used in those verses is ***"baptized"*** not ***"baptism."***

Grievous Wolf states *"immersion, because sprinkling was the mode of baptism in 1611AD, they jelly-fished out and transliterated the Greek "baptizo" but refused to translate it."*

It is first noteworthy that Grievous Wolf does not request that a particular denomination rename itself the Immersionist Church or that he who said ***"I am the voice of one crying in the wilderness"*** John 1:23 should be renamed 'John the Immersionist.'

However, Grievous Wolf is lying. He is also being wilfully ignorant, again. See *Answers to the Wolf-Man*.

The following article[8], published originally by the Trinitarian Bible Society, though disparaging of the 1611 Holy Bible in its last paragraph, nevertheless shows that Wolf is lying with respect the word ***"baptism."***

Article No.43

The use of the word "BAPTIST" in the King James Version of l611

It has been suggested that the Greek word BAPTIZO should have been translated "TO IMMERSE" and that the translators failed to translate the word, but merely transliterated it, in deference to the ecclesiastical views of King James I. This criticism is not supported by the facts, which are as follows.

The rules of procedure drawn up before the commencement of the work did not contain any specific reference to baptism and King James did not attempt to superintend the work in any way. The six translation committees worked at Westminster, Oxford and Cambridge. Each member completed his own rendering of the whole portion assigned to the Committee and then submitted it to the other members. When agreement was reached the committee sent its portion to the other committees for revision and approval, and finally a small sub-committee under Miles Smith checked the whole.

The primary meaning of the English word "baptize" is "to immerse" and the translators used the word in this sense. They were all familiar with the Book of Common Prayer authorised by Queen Elizabeth I in 1559 and the earlier Prayer Books of Edward VI issued in 1549 and 1552. The 1549 book required "trine immersion" and the 1552 and 1559 books merely required that the minister should take the child and..."shal dippe it in the water." The slight revision of the Prayer Book in 1604 did not affect this requirement, so it is evident that the translators, who were members of the Church of England, understood the word "baptism" to signify "dippe it in the water", or "to immerse."

It is not the object of the present article to discuss infant baptism, "baptismal regeneration", or any error which may be entertained on this subject, but merely to show that the translators of 1611 used a familiar English word meaning "to immerse." The English word "BAPTIZE" is not a direct transliteration from the Greek, and it was certainly not coined by the translators. It was in fact used in English literature as early as the year 1200 A.D. and was well established in the language for nearly two hundred years before Wyclif used it in his translation in 1382 A.D. In his version we find - "to be BAPTISED", "BAPTYM", "BAPTYSING", "BAPTEM", "I BAPTISE", "HE SHALL BAPTISE", etc.

The Greek BAPTISMOS was first taken into the Latin tongue, and according to Andrews' Latin-English Lexicon founded on Freund's Latin-German Lexicon, the Latin BAPTISMA meant "a dipping in, a dipping under, immersion, ablution", and is thus used by Prudentius, a Christian Poet in A.D. 397. The form "BAPTISMUM" is found often in the writings of Tertullian, Augustine, etc. The "BAPTISTERIUM" was "a bathing or swimming place, a vessel for bathing in"; in ecclesiastical Latin a "baptistery" or baptismal font (in which the person was "dipped" or "immersed").

According to Prof. Skeat the Greek BAPTIZEIN was taken into Latin as BAPTIZARE, and thence into Old French as BAPTISER, and then into Middle English as BAPTISEN. In this way the word had a settled place in the language long before Wyclif's time and 400 years before the time of the King James Version. In due course Tyndale used the word in his 1524 N.T., and the Great Bible of 1538, the Geneva Version of 1560, and the Bishop's Bible of 1568 all translate the Greek BAPTIZEIN in this way.

Several other European languages have a similar word derived from the Greek through the Latin - Portuguese BATIZAR, BATISMO etc. Spanish - BAUTIZAR, BAUTISMO etc., French - BAPTISER, BAPTEME. The derivation and use of these words in English, French, Spanish and Portuguese were not in any way influenced by King James I or by the ecclesiastical views of the translators. The Greek BAPTIZEIN means to immerse, the Latin BAPTIZARE means to immerse, and the English BAPTIZE, French BAPTISER, Spanish BAUTIZAR and Portuguese BATIZAR - all mean "to immerse."

Even some of the most powerful advocates of infant baptism have felt unable to argue about the precise meaning of the Greek BAPTIZEIN. Calvin's Institutes contain a section on infant baptism, but the writer candidly admits, "the mere term, Baptize means to immerse entirely, and it is certain that the custom of thus entirely immersing was anciently observed in the Church." (French version)

Those who consider the Scriptural ordinance to require the immersion of a believer after a profession of faith should not reject the word "baptism" merely because it is often misused. They should rather be encouraged to know that they are correctly using a word which was used by the inspired Apostles and by their Divine Master.

The English language has preserved the word and its original meaning and this is recognised in the normal usage of the English speaking world. Thus a "Baptist" is one who practices "believer's baptism by immersion"; a ''Baptist Church" is a local congregation of "believers baptized by immersion", "Baptist Mid-Missions'', "The General Association of Regular Baptist Churches", "The Conservative Baptists", "The Strict Baptists", etc. are all immediately recognised by the word "Baptist" as groups of believers practising baptism by immersion. There is no need to change the word, for it is universally recognised as being the most appropriate in the English language. Whatever may have been the K.J.V. translators' view of the ordinance of baptism, it cannot be questioned that they translated the word correctly, with scrupulous fidelity to the Greek, with full knowledge of the meaning of the English word then already at least four hundred years old, without any deference to King James I and without grinding any ecclesiastical axe of their own.

They were not perfect men, they did not produce a perfect version, but it cannot be denied that they translated the Greek BAPRIZEIN correctly by the English word BAPTIZE.

<u>Luke 18:12</u> ***"tithes of all I possess"***

Grievous Wolf states *""all I acquire" (Not only variant with the TR, but quite wrong. Tithes were never paid on capital, only increase)."*

James White has the same objection to Luke 18:12 as Grievous Wolf. It is answered as follows[9]. Additions are in braces [].

White's next objection is to the word ***"possess"*** in Luke 18:12, because he prefers *"get"* or similar, as found in the NASV and the [1984NIV, 2005TNIV, 2011NIV], JB, [NJB, Grievous Wolf continues to appreciate the company of Rome], NWT. See ***Appendix***, ***Table A1*** [in *KJO Review Full*].

White states that, his emphases, *"Another less-than-sterling translation is found at Luke 18:12…Did the Pharisee tithe on his* ***possessions*** *or his* ***increase****? The term means to "procure for oneself, acquire, get.""*

The bibles of the English Protestant Reformation, Wycliffe, Tyndale, Geneva and Bishops' all have ***"possess"*** in agreement with the AV1611 or similar, Wycliffe reading *"have in possession."* The AV1611, therefore, continues to preserve the God-honoured Traditional Text recognized by true bible believers from earliest times.

As usual, it is White's opinion that is *"less-than-sterling."* The term ***"possess"*** covers all possibilities, including getting or acquiring but with the added emphasis on holding onto or owning what is acquired.

This sense is found repeatedly in the Old Testament, where most of the 106 occurrences of the term ***"possess"*** in the scriptures are found. For example:

"That in blessing I will bless thee, and in multiplying I will multiply thy seed as the stars of the heaven, and as the sand which is upon the sea shore; and thy seed shall possess the gate of his enemies" Genesis 22:17.

"And Caleb stilled the people before Moses, and said, Let us go up at once, and possess it; for we are well able to overcome it" Numbers 13:30.

Concerning the Pharisees, White should have compared ***"spiritual things with spiritual"*** 1 Corinthians 2:13b. Each Pharisee tithed not only what he acquired but also what he owned, e.g. the produce of his ***"garden of herbs"*** 1 Kings 21:2.

"Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye pay tithe of mint and anise and cummin, and have omitted the weightier matters of the law, judgment, mercy, and faith: these ought ye to have done, and not to leave the other undone" Matthew 23:23.

"But woe unto you, Pharisees! for ye tithe mint and rue and all manner of herbs, and pass over judgment and the love of God: these ought ye to have done, and not to leave the other undone" Luke 11:42.

Again, the AV1611 is right and the modern versions, along with James White [and Grievous Wolf], are wrong.

Galatians 3:24 ***"schoolmaster"***

Grievous Wolf states *""attendant" (the law was the one who brought us to Christ, not taught us about Christ)."*

Both Grievous Wolf's reading *"attendant"* and his explanation of Galatians 3:24 are wrong.

Galatians 3:24 states ***"Wherefore the law was our schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith."***

All the 16th century bibles, Tyndale, Coverdale, Great, Bishops', Geneva, have *"schoolmaster"* in agreement with the 1611 Holy Bible.

The Wycliffe Bible has *"undermaster"* i.e. a junior schoolmaster but still a schoolmaster.

The modern versions DRB, RV, ASV, NASV, 1984NIV, 2005TNIV, 2011NIV, NKJV, JB, NJB, NWT all change the word ***"schoolmaster"*** in the AV1611 but none of them has *"attendant."* None of the English Interlinears for the Greek texts of Ricker Berry's edition of Stephanus's 1550 Edition, Nestle's 21st Edition and the Farstad-Hodges so-called 'Majority' Text reads *"attendant"* in Galatians 3:24. *Young's Analytical Concordance* does not give *"attendant"* as an alternative term for ***"schoolmaster"*** in the AV1611.

Even W. E. Vine, who is notably hostile to the 1611 Holy Bible, does not give *"attendant"* as an alternative term for ***"schoolmaster"*** in the AV1611 in his *Expository Dictionary of Bible Words*. See below.

Grievous Wolf's objection to ***"schoolmaster"*** in Galatians 3:24 in the AV1611 is answered as follows[10]. Again, it will be seen that the 1611 Holy Bible is right and the critics, including Grievous Wolf, are wrong.

Our critic's next *"error"* is in **Galatians 3:24** where ***"our schoolmaster"***, AV1611, should - apparently - be changed to the NIV's *"put in charge."* The JB has *"guardian"*, Ne [Nestle's 21st Edition] has *"trainer"* and the NWT with the English renderings of the other Greek editions have *"tutor"*.

The supposed error here is described by Vine in his *Expository Dictionary of Bible Words*: *"The paidagogus ("schoolmaster") was not the instructor of the child; he exercised a general supervision over him and was responsible for his moral and physical well-being. Thus understood, paidagogus is appropriately used with 'kept in ward' and 'shut up,' whereas to understand it as equivalent to 'teacher' introduces an idea entirely foreign to the passage, and throws the Apostle's argument into confusion."*

The English word 'pedagogue' is from 'paidagogus' and means 'Schoolmaster' or 'teacher', although usually in a derogatory sense, implying pedantry. Nevertheless, *"pedagogy"* is *"science of teaching"* in the normal sense.

However, could either W. E. Vine or our critic seriously believe that the Law was not there to TEACH, especially in regard to the Lord Jesus Christ?

"Search the Scriptures; for in them ye think ye have eternal life: and they are they which testify of me" John 5:39.

"And beginning at Moses and all the prophets, he expounded unto them in all the scriptures the things concerning himself" Luke 24:27.

"All things must be fulfilled, which were written in the law of Moses, and in the prophets, and in the psalms concerning me" Luke 24:44b.

"I have more understanding than ALL MY TEACHERS: for THY TESTIMONIES are my meditation" Psalm 119:99.

"The law of the Lord is perfect, CONVERTING the soul: the testimony of the Lord is sure, Making WISE the simple" Psalm 19:8.

Is the pedantic (!), literal, 'original' sense of 'pedagogue' as *"put in charge,"* likely to be 'clearer' to the modern reader than SCHOOLMASTER? For every one child who had the former, there must be untold thousands who have had the latter. Moreover, how could the law *"lead us to Christ"*, NIV, if it was simply *"put in charge"*? In Acts 16:24, a JAILOR was *"put in charge"* of Paul and Silas and did not *"lead"* them anywhere. (He THRUST them into the inner prison.)

In his commentary on *Galatians*, p 103, Dr. Ruckman states: *"The law was a teacher, and everyday it taught the same lesson – "YOU ARE A SINNER." It kept this curriculum through 1400 years (or more) of history and absolutely prevented any man from justifying himself (Luke 16:15). Even those who walked blameless in the Law (Luke 1:6, Phil. 3:3-6) still had to trust the shed blood of the lamb; and all the lambs in Asia, Africa, and Europe could not REDEEM the* ***"transgressions"*** *(Rom 3:25) which were under the first covenant. There is only one door out of the classroom, and the class will not dismiss until Revelation 21. Christ is* ***"THE DOOR."*** *You can no more "go home for recess" through Buddha, Lao Tse, and Mohammed than you can bust your way out of a Bank Vault with a toothbrush."*

Grievous Wolf could benefit from having the 1611 Holy Bible as his ***"schoolmaster."***

1 Samuel 10:24, 2 Samuel 16:16, 1 Kings 1:25 ***"God save the king"***

Grievous Wolf states *""May the king live" ("God" not in TR, but reflects the British culture of the 1600's. Proof that the translators used dynamic equivalents.)*

1 Kings 1:25 actually says ***"God save king Adonijah"***

The expression ***"God save the king"*** occurs 5 times in the scriptures, 1 Samuel 10:24, 2 Samuel 16:16 twice, 2 Kings 11:21, 2 Chronicles 23:11.

"God save the king" is not the British culture of the 1600s. The expression is found in the Bibles of the 1500s with only slight variation, i.e. Coverdale *"God save the new king,"* Matthews *"God lend the king life,"* Great *"God lend the king life,"* Bishops' *"God save the king,"* Geneva *"God save the king."*

Attacking the expression ***"God save the king"*** is popular with Bible critics. See the following extract from this writer's work *"O Biblios" – The Book* pp 200-201 and the uploaded file pp 154-155, www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/. Additional comments are in braces [].

10.12. *"Unwarranted Paraphrasing in the KJV"*

Our critic states ***"This is very evident when the following texts are seen in the original."*** Again, his terminology is not very precise because once again, he does not specify what the original is [Grievous Wolf doesn't either]. Moreover, he does not explain why such *"paraphrasing"*, if indeed it is, is *"unwarranted"* and why a literal rendering would be superior.

His first examples are in **1 Samuel 10:24** and **2 Kings 11:12**, where ***"God save the king,"*** AV1611, should be *"Long live the king"* or similar as in the NIV, JB, NWT, [NJB, NKJV, 1984NIV, 2005TNIV, 2011NIV].

Regardless of any complaints about *"paraphrasing"*, 1 Timothy 2:1-4 IN THE BIBLE, not *"the Greek"*, shows that the AV1611 is perfectly in order and SUPERIOR TO THE LITERAL HEBREW.

Moreover, I am just old enough to remember when the National Anthem was literally ***"God save the King."*** It is hardly surprising that the Roman Catholic 'bibles', NIV etc. would object to the reading [like Grievous Wolf does, yet again the papa's pal]. It would appear therefore, that our critic seeks not only to deprive me of the words of the Bible but also the words of the National Anthem, which were engraved on the hearts of school children for generations across the world wherever the Union Jack floated on the breeze. (Even the flag of the British nation is now threatened with extinction by the 12 pentagram Romish, demonic circle of the EU banner. See *The Principality and Power of Europe*, by Adrian Hilton, 2nd edition, 2000, Dorchester House Publications, p 55, 165-166 and *The Tower of Eurobabel*, International Currency Review 23, 4, p 46.)

Will Kinney has an excellent article on the expression ***"God save the king."*** Some extracts follow. Observe that Will Kinney has addressed the subject of dynamic equivalence for which Grievous Wolf criticises the 1611 Holy Bible.

See brandplucked.webs.com/godsavetheking.htm, www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/ *Will Kinney's articles on the AV issue*. Additional comments are in braces [].

"God Save the King"

One of the phrases frequently attacked in the King James Bible is "God save the king".

A modern version proponent recently wrote our Which Version club with the following criticism.

"There is another set of passages in which the King James Version translators used a dynamic equivalence method in which they inserted God's name where it is not in the

original. This is in the phrases "God save the king" and "God save king [king's name]" in 1 Samuel 10:24; 2 Samuel 16:16; 1 Kings 1:25,1 Kings 1:34, 1 Kings 1:39, 2 Kings 11:12; and 2 Chronicles 23:11.

This person then goes on to say that the King James translation of "God save the king" is "DEPLORABLE" because 1. a literal, word-for-word translation method was not used 2. the translators used colloquialism and idiom 3. they deceive the reader into thinking that these words are in the original 4. they take God's name in vain.

I am often amazed at the criticisms against the King James Bible that the modern version proponents bring up. They don't usually discover these things for themselves but copy and paste them from some anti-KJV site, like those of Doug Kutilek or James White [and Grievous Wolf and friends].

They profess a great love for God's words, yet if you ask them where we common Christians can get a copy of the infallible words of God, they soon reveal that the only "infallible bible" they have exists solely in their minds and imaginations [again, like Grievous Wolf]. *They don't believe any translation can be the infallible words of God nor do they have any "Hebrew and Greek texts" that completely represent the originals* [see Grievous Wolf's *Questions 65, 66, 67,* www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/james-white-dr-divietro-and-dawaite.php, *Answers to the Wolf-Man*]. *Their mystical bible is made up of their own personal opinions and preferences, and of course, their "bible" differs from the "bible" the next scholar has dreamed up for himself. Each man becomes his own final authority - "In those days there was no king in Israel; every man did that which was right in his own eyes." Judges 21:25.*

The KJB critic often fails to be aware of the fact that those versions so commonly recommended as being "reliable translations", like the NASB, NIV, ESV, NKJV, often do the very things they condemn in the KJB.

"And Samuel said to all the people, See ye him whom the LORD hath chosen, that there is none like him among all the people? And all the people shouted, and said, GOD SAVE THE KING." 1 Samuel 10:24.

Not only does the KJB correctly express this as "God save the king" but so also do Miles Coverdale 1535, The Great Bible (Cranmer) 1540, Matthew's Bible (John Rogers) 1549, the Bishop's Bible 1568, the Geneva Bible of 1599, the Revised Version of 1881, Webster's 1833 translation, the Douay version of 1950, the KJV 21st Century Version 1994, the Third [Millennium] Bible 1998, God's First Truth version 1999, The Word of Yah translation 1993, the Urim-Thummin Version 2001, the Messianic Torah Transliteration Scriptures - http://www.messianic-torah-truth-seeker.org/Scriptures/ and Darby's translation employs the same phrase in 1 Kings 1:25.

Realize that the King James Bible and all these other versions are English translations, written to English speaking persons (the target audience) expressing what this Hebrew phrase means in English. We do not have kings here in America, but those God fearing nations that had or continue to have kings or queens to this day still say 'God save the king' or 'God save the queen'.

The fact is directly implied and recognized that it is God who gives and preserves the life of the king, as well as everyone else on this planet.

Deuteronomy 32:39 "See now that I, even I, am he, and there is no god with me: I kill, and I MAKE ALIVE; I wound, and I heal: neither is there any that can deliver out of my hand."

"The Spirit of God hath made me, and the breath of the Almighty HATH GIVEN ME LIFE." Job 33:4.

"The LORD killeth, AND MAKETH ALIVE; he bringeth down to the grave, and bringeth up." 1 Samuel 2:6.

"And now, behold, the LORD HATH KEPT ME ALIVE, as he said, these forty years..." Joshua 14:10.

"Behold now, thy servant hath found grace in thy sight, and thou hast magnified thy mercy, which thou hast shewed unto me IN SAVING my life" Genesis 19:19.

"But the midwives feared God, and did not as the king of Egypt commanded them, but SAVED the men children ALIVE."

All these verses use the very same Hebrew word used in the expression "God SAVE the king."

The verb used here is...ghah-yah, and is variously translated as "to live, to be whole, to revive, to recover, to quicken, to give life, to make alive, to keep alive, to restore to life, and to save."

The King James Bible, as well as the Geneva bible, Revised Version and all the others recognize the theological truth that it is God who saves the king alive or takes his life away, and express this theological truth in the English language.

If you want to get technical, it should be noted that in the modern translations, such as the NKJV, NIV, NASB, which say "LONG live the king", there is no corresponding word for "long" either. These translations express a merely secular wish for a long life without regard for the fact that it is God who gives, preserves, maintains, and saves alive.

It seems a bit hypocritical to say the KJB is adding the word "God", even though it is definitely implied in biblical theology, when all the new versions do this very thing themselves.

In the NIV alone, they have added the word "God" 104 times when not strictly found in the Old Testament Hebrew texts, added "God" 117 times to the New Testament and the word "Jesus" 336 times to the New Testament when not found in any Greek text.

Likewise the NASB adds the word God or Lord in Exodus 33:9; 34:10; 1 Samuel 16:7; 2 Kings 19:23; 2 Kings 23:19; 2 Chron. 32:24; Job 21:17, 19; Hosea 1:6, 9; Matthew 15:5; Acts 7:4; 19:26, Romans 11:28, and in Matthew 16:22 has that dreaded "God forbid" when 'God' literally is not in the text.

The NKJV also "adds" the word God or Lord to Exodus 33:9; 1 Samuel 3:17; 2 Kings 23:19; 2 Chronicles 3:1; 2 Chron. 18:21; Job 7:4; 15:15; 24:22; Lamentations 3:28; Romans 3:29, Acts 7:5 and in Galatians 6:14 again has that dreaded "God forbid" with no 'God' literally in the text...

[Grievous Wolf recommends the NIV. NASV, NKJV. He obviously hasn't studied them.]

In Romans 11:4 the King James Bible reads: "But what saith the answer of God unto him?" The NIV reads, "And what was God's answer to him?" It is interesting to note that there is no word in ANY Greek text for the word "God". Despite this fact the NIV reads "God's answer".

The last word in the previous phrase is 'chrematismos' and it carries the idea of 1) an answer from God or 2) a divine response or revelation. To communicate the meaning of the

Greek in this sentence the word "God" or "Divine" must be "added"...to the English text. In fact, if "God" were not 'added' then the sense of the verse would be lost.

Another example is found in Matthew 2:22, using the same word as in Romans 11:4. The KJB reads, "And being WARNED OF GOD in a dream that they should not return to Herod, they departed into their own country another way."

Here the NASV reads, "And having been warned by God..."; the NKJV reads, "And being warned by God..." Once again we see that the NASV, NKJV have committed the unpardonable sin, according to Bible critic, of stating "by God" when God is not in the Greek text.

The NASB, using this same Greek word, "adds" the word God or Divine in Matthew 2:12, 22; Acts 10:22, Romans 11:4, and in Hebrews 8:5 and 11:7, and the 2001 ESV does the same thing in Romans 11:4; Hebrews 8:5 and 11:7.

The NKJV also does this in Matthew 2:12, 22; Acts 10:22, Romans 11:4, Hebrews 8:5 and 11:7. These modern versions at other times render the same word as "called, warned, or revealed", and leave out the part about God. Sometimes the idea of God is implied in certain contexts and at other times it is not; this is how biblical languages work.

Likewise in Mark 7:11 we read in all texts: "But ye say, If a man shall say to his father or mother, It is Corban, that is to say, A GIFT (dooron), by whatsoever thou mightest be profited by me; he shall be free."

However instead of the simple word "gift", the NASB, NIV, ESV all add the word GOD to the text by saying: "given TO GOD", while the NKJV paraphrases and adds these words: "dedicated TO THE TEMPLE", none of which are found in any Greek text.

The clear facts are that both the Hebrew and the Greek texts allow for 'God' to be implicitly stated in many expressions, even though strictly speaking, the literal word for God is not there in the text. There is nothing wrong, incorrect or deplorable in the Bishop's Bible, Coverdale, the Geneva Bible, the KJB, the Revised Version, Webster's, Douay, Darby, or the Third Millennium Bible by translating the phrase as "God save the king." Those who claim it is wrong merely show their ignorance of how languages work when translated from one into another.

For another directly related subject showing the hypocrisy of the modern versionists who criticize the KJB for saying "God forbid" see brandplucked.webs.com/godforbid.htm God Forbid.

The expression ***"God forbid"*** is Grievous Wolf's very next objection to the 1611 Holy Bible.

Grievous Wolf should review 1 Peter 2:17.

"Honour all men. Love the brotherhood. Fear God. Honour the king."

Romans 3:4, 6, 31, 6:2, 15, 7:7, 13, 9:14, 11:1, 11, 1 Corinthians 6:15; Galatians 2:17, 3:21, 6:14 ***"God forbid"***

Grievous Wolf states *""may it not be" or "let it not be." (KJV adds the word God where it is absent in the TR because it was a common expression in 1600's. Proof that the translators used dynamic equivalents.)"*

See the following extract from this writer's work *"O Biblios" – The Book* pp 200-201 and the uploaded file pp 153-154, www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/. Additional comments are in braces [].

Our critic's next *"paraphrase"* is in **Romans 6:1**, actually verse 2, where ***"God forbid"***, AV1611, should be *"By no means"* or similar, as in the NIV, JB, NWT, [NJB, NKJV, 1984NIV, 2005TNIV, 2011NIV] and the English renderings of the Greek texts.

[Note that in Luke 20:16, the 2005TNIV, 2011NIV read *"God forbid"* as the AV1611. See Will Kinney's article below.]

Dr. Ruckman [in *How To Teach The Original Greek* pp 33-34] states *""The expression* "me genoito" *is a fairly common Pauline locution" (Carson, The King James Version Debate, p. 92). This is translated by the "King's men" as* ***"God forbid"*** *(Rom. 3:4, 1 Cor. 6:15). On the grounds that the word "God" is not found in any Greek text...Carson says the NIV rendering translates the expression PERFECTLY (ibid). How does this Jesuit, Dark Age revision translate "me genoito"? It says, "not at all" the first time (Rom. 3:4), but "never" the second time (1 Cor. 6:15)."*

The NIV gives *"me genoito"* as *"by no means"* in Romans 6:2. Yet our critic complains about the AV1611's *"Failure to render the same Hebrew or Greek word by the same English equivalent"*, Section 10.8. Dr. Ruckman continues:

"Well, is "oudepo", "me pote", "oudepote" ("NEVER") found anywhere, in any Greek text used by the NIV? No, it isn't. They added "never" after saying you couldn't add "God." Did they translate the Optative (genoito)? No, they didn't even attempt to. They just ignored it...so, presuming himself to be the final authority, (Carson) says the NIV catches the expression "PERFECTLY."

"It does? Well, WHO is it that lets things "be, or not be?" WHO is it that can let a thing happen, or prevent it from happening? Are we to assume a converted Orthodox Jewish rabbinical scholar (Phil. 3) wouldn't have THAT in mind when he said "Let it not be!"?...

"If you were a Bible-believing Christian, you would know it was a prayer as well as a denial. Paul is asking God to forbid such a thing from happening. (This is where the NIV got "NEVER" from). God is going to forbid it from "being" (happening). But without God as the source for letting some things happen, while stopping other things from "becoming," the expression is not translated at all. It is missing its most essential element: THE ONE WHO FORBIDS."

Will Kinney has an excellent article on the expression ***"God forbid."***

See brandplucked.webs.com/godforbid.htm and www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/ *Will Kinney's articles on the AV issue.* Extracts from Will Kinney's article follow.

"GOD FORBID!"

Doug Kutilek is a virulent critic of the King James Bible. He has written this short article criticizing the rendering of "God forbid" as is found in the Holy Bible. Here is his opinion and then I will post the refutation.

Doug Kutilek writes: The phrase "God forbid" occurs some 24 times in the King James Version of the Bible. Nine of these occurrences are in the OT (and thrice the similar "the LORD forbid"), while fifteen are found in the NT. Of the NT occurrences, all but one are found in the writings of Paul.

As has been pointed out countless times with regard to the use of the phrase "God forbid" to render the words of the original Hebrew and Greek, it is a close English equivalent except for two facts: 1. the word "God" is not found in the original text; and 2. neither is the word "forbid." Other than that, it is a fine representation of the original!

It is obvious, of course, that here at least, the KJV is not a literal translation of the original, but is at best a paraphrase, a "dynamic equivalent." (Do I hear some rigid KJV adherent mutter under his breath, "God forbid!"?)

The NT passages, gleaned from Strong's concordance, are Luke 20:16; Romans 3:4; 3:6; 3:31; 6:2; 6:15; 7:7; 7:13; 9:14; 11:1; 11:11; I Corinthians 6:15; Galatians 2:17; 3:21; 6:14. In every case but the last, the phrase is a self-standing grammatical unit, expressing strong opposition or rejection of a just mentioned opinion, point of view, or implied answer to a question. In Galatians 6:14, it is incorporated into a sentence.

In all 15 references, the Greek phrase is identical: ME GENOITO. ME is a negative particle usually used with verbs in the subjunctive, optative or imperative moods. GENOITO is a rare NT occurrence of a verb in the optative mood (just 56 cases in all). It is from the verb GINOMAI, "to be, become, happen," etc. Taken together, the phrase may be literally rendered, "may it not be," a phrase weaker in force in English than the Greek original.

Modern English equivalents would be "not at all!" or "absolutely not!" or "certainly not!" or "by no means" or "under no circumstances" or "perish the thought!" or even the colloquial, "no way, Jose!" (see the New King James Bible, New American Standard Bible, and New International Version in the passages involved).

While all of these modern renderings are other than strictly literal renderings of ME GENOITO, they at least have the advantage over the KJV rendering of not introducing the name of God where it is not found in the original.

Frankly, I am at a loss to explain how it came to pass that "God forbid," came to be considered by Wycliffe and other early English translators from Tyndale to the KJV as a suitable and correct translation of the Greek ME GENOITO. It was strictly a phenomenon that arose in the then-very small English-speaking world, as far as I can tell. It cannot be defended as "the closest possible English equivalent." The renderings of the NKJB, NASB, and NIV are very much to be preferred to it.

- Doug Kutilek "AS I SEE IT" Volume 4, Number 4, April, 2001

And now for my rebuttal.

All previous English versions use this same expression, "God forbid", including Wycliffe 1380, 1395; Tyndale 1525, 1534; Coverdale 1535; The Great Bible (Cranmer) 1539, Matthew's Bible (John Rogers) 1549, the Bishop's Bible 1568, the Geneva Bible 1557, 1587,1599, 1602, and the Douay-Rheims version of 1609...

Mr Kutilek apparently is totally unaware that the NASB has 'God forbid" in Mat. 16:22 where his own scholarly standards would condemn this version he recommends. It is a different Greek construction, but again neither the words "God" nor "forbid" are found there. Both the NASB and the NIV frequently add the words God or Lord when they are not "in the original text".

Surprise! Even the New KJV, which he told us to consult, has rendered the exact same "me genoito" as God forbid in Galatians 6:14 ! Oh, wait! There's even more. The "old" NIV of 1985 had completely omitted all references to "God forbid" when translating the words me genoito and translated it as "May this never be!" in Luke 20:16. But now in 2005 in the TNIV and again in 2011 the "new" New International Version have come out, and guess what they did. They have now translated this same phrase as "God forbid!"

In fact this is the definition that the Oxford Greek Dictionary gives. Also Constantine Tsirpanlis, former Instructor in Modern Greek Language and Literature at New York

University, Former Consultant for the Program in Modern Greek Studies at Hunter College, Professor of Church History and Greek Studies at Unification Theological Seminary, gives the definition of "me genoito" on page 72 of his book, "Modern Greek Idiom And Phrase Book," Barron's Educational Services, Inc., 1978, ISBN 0-8120-0476-0. The ONLY definition Tsirpanlis (a native Greek) gives for "me genoito" is "God forbid!" There is NO reference to "may it never be", "by no means" or "certainly not"!

The proper force of this Greek phrase 'me genoito' is to express a negative in the strongest of possible terms. The English equivalent of "God forbid" perfectly and accurately expresses this thought, whereas such phrases as "may it not be" come across as prissy and effeminate.

Mr. Kutilek chides our AV because "God" is not literally found in the text. In spite of all his learning he has little understanding of how languages work and exalts his opinion above any bible version out there today.

Another example using the verb kreematizo and the noun kreematismos is found in Romans 11:4 "But what saith the answer of God unto him?". The NIV reads, "And what was God's answer to him?" It is interesting to note that there is no word in ANY Greek text for the word "God". Despite this fact the NIV reads "God's answer". Now I wonder what Mr. Kutilek would say to that?

Literally the Greek of Rom. 11:4 reads, "alla ti legei autoo ho kreematismos". The last word in the previous phrase is 'kreematismos' and it carries the idea of 1) an answer from God or 2) a divine response or revelation. So, in order to accurately preserve the Greek in this sentence the word "God" or "Divine" must be "added"...to the English text. In fact if "God" were not 'added' then the sense of the verse would be lost.

The verb form is found in Matthew 2:12, 22; Acts 10:22; and Hebrews 8:5 and 11:7. In Matthew 2:12 and 22 the KJB reads, "And being warned of God". The NASB likewise reads in both, "And having been warned by God", and so does the NKJV in 2:22. The NASB also renders this verb as "warned by God" twice in Hebrews 8:5 and 11:7. The NKJV reads "divinely instructed", though strictly speaking the words God or Divinely are not "literally" there. Once again we see that the NASB, NKJV and NIV have committed the unpardonable sin, according to Mr. Kutilek, of saying "by God" when God is not in the Greek text.

The brand new 2001 English Standard Version also "adds" the word God in the expressions "warned of God", "God's reply", and "instructed by God" in Romans 11:4; Hebrews 8:5 and Hebrews 11:7. It also adds the word God to other passages when not literally found in the Greek. Likewise the New Jerusalem Bible of 1985 has "me genoito" as "God forbid" in Luke 20:16 and has the expression "warned of God" in Acts 10:22, Hebrews 8:5 and 11:7 as well.

Another example of "God not being in the text" is found in the NASB three times in Acts 13:43; and Acts 17:4 and 17. In Acts 13:43 the KJB, as well as the NKJV, RV, ASV, and even the NIV read: "many of the Jews and RELIGIOUS (or devout) proselytes followed Paul and Barnabas". The word is sebomai and there is nothing literally found about God in the word at all. Even [in] the NASB in this same chapter verse 50 the word is simply translated as "devout." However in Acts 13:43, 17:4 and 17 the NASB reads "GOD-fearing", with no literal "God" in any Greek text. The NIV too switches gears and in both Acts 17:4 and 17 likewise "adds" the word God just like the NASB, but not so the KJB, NKJV, RV or ASV.

The NASB and other modern versions often add the words Jesus, God and Lord to their translation, when these words are not found in the Hebrew and Greek texts. The NASB adds the word "Jesus" in Mark 1:45; Luke 22:63, and Acts 3:16; Acts 9:22. It also adds the word "God" in 1 Samuel 16:7, adds "God" in Job 20:23 (as well as the RV, ASV, RSV, NRSV,

ESV, NKJV, NIV, NET and Holman Standard) and 21:17 (as well as the NIV, NKJV, RV, ASV, NET, RSV, NRSV and ESV), "God" in Isaiah 37:20 (from Dead Sea Scrolls, but not from Hebrew Masoretic text), Nehemiah 6:9 (along with the RV, ASV, NKJV, RSV, NRSV, ESV, etc.), Matthew 15:5, 16:22, Acts 3:19, Acts 7:4, Acts 13:43, Acts 19:26, Acts 26:7 - "serving GOD" (along with the NIV, NKJV, NET) Romans 11:28, 1 Peter 2:9; and "Lord" in Exodus 33:9, Exodus 34:10, 2 Kings 23:19, Job 21:19, 2 Chronicles 32:24. 2 Chronicles 33:19 add "God" (NASB, NIV, RSV, NRSV, ESV, NET, NKJV, RV, ASV and Holman Standard too) Hosea 1:6, 9, and 10:2.

1 Peter 2:9 KJB - "But ye are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, an holy nation, a peculiar people."

NASB 1995 - But you are A CHOSEN RACE, A royal PRIESTHOOD, A HOLY NATION, ***A PEOPLE FOR God's OWN POSSESSION.***

NIV 1984 edition - But you are a chosen people, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, ***a people belonging to God****,*

NIV 2011 edition - But you are a chosen people, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, ***God's special possession***

It is a bit hypocritical to hear the new versionists complain about the KJB "adding" the word 'God' to such expressions as "God forbid", and then turn around and add the word 'God' themselves when it most definitely is not in any Greek text at all.

In Ecclesiastes 2:26 we read: "For GOD giveth to a man that is good in his sight wisdom, and knowledge, and joy..." Even though the word GOD is not in the Hebrew texts, translations like the ASV, RV, NKJV, NIV, RSV, NRSV, ESV and many others "add" the word so the passage makes sense. The NASB and Holman add the word "HE", referring to God, and not even in italics, for the same reason.

Jeremiah 3:1 - "THEY SAY, If a man put away his wife...". So read the King James Bible, the Geneva Bible, the NKJV, RV, ASV, Darby and the Spanish Reina Valera. However the NASB adds the word "God" here without any textual support from the Hebrew Scriptures. The NASB reads: "GOD says, If a husband divorces his wife..." The NIV, RSV, ESV and Holman just omit the phrase altogether, but the RSV, ESV footnotes inform us that the omission is due to the Syriac and the Greek, but that the Hebrew texts read "saying". So, this is another case of the NASB adding the word GOD when it is not in the text, and the NIV, ESV, Holman omitting what the Hebrew texts do read.

Acts 7:4 is a bit interesting in that all Greek texts read as the King James Bible has it with: "...when his father was dead, HE removed him into this land, wherein ye now dwell." The 1963 and 1972 NASBs put GOD in the text with no italics, but in 1977 and again in 1995 they placed it in italics. The online NASB still has it not in italics. Likewise the RSV, NRSV, ESV, NIV, Holman and NET versions place the word GOD in the text (with no italics), when in fact it is not there. The point being, it is highly hypocritical of the modern versionists to criticize the King James Bible for doing something that they themselves do as much or more than that great old Book.

Likewise in Mark 7:11 we read in all texts: "But ye say, If a man shall say to his father or mother, It is Corban, that is to say, A GIFT (dooron), by whatsoever thou mightest be profited by me; he shall be free."

However instead of the simple word "gift", the NASB, NIV, ESV all add the word GOD to the text by saying: "given TO GOD", while the NKJV paraphrases and adds these words: "dedicated TO THE TEMPLE", none of which are found in any Greek text.

The NIV likewise mistranslates the word hagios, which means saints, as "God's people" a total of ten times in the New Testament. Neither the words "God" nor "people" are there in any text

The NIV continually adds to and takes away from the true words of God in both the Old and New testaments. There are certain expressions where the word God or Lord are implied, as in 'God forbid' or 'God save the king', and in these cases the KJB as well as many other translations express this. However in the NIV what we often find is the word "God" or "Lord" being left out of these expressions and instead, the NIV adds the words God, Lord, Jesus or Christ when it is not in any text, be it Hebrew or Greek.

You might want to take a look at the NIV complete concordance for yourself. In it you will find by their own documentation that the NIV has added the name of Jesus to the New Testament a total of 336 times when it is not found in the Greek texts they themselves are using. That's three hundred and thirty six times!

The NIV has omitted the name of God or JEHOVAH...thirty eight times (38 not translated) and 52 times they have added LORD, or GOD when it is not in the Hebrew text.

The word Elohim, or God found on page 454 of the NIV concordance, has not been translated 13 times when found in the Hebrew text and it was placed in the NIV text another 52 times when not in the Hebrew for a total of the word "God" being added 104 times and not translated when it is in the text 51 times, and all this just in the Old Testament.

The NIV has also ADDED the word God 117 times in the New Testament when it does not occur in any Greek text nor when it expresses the idea of "God forbid" and they have not translated it three times when it is in their Greek texts.

Likewise the NIV has added the word Christ 15 times when not in any Greek text. See for example Colossians 1:22; 2:9, 10 and 13. The NIV has also added the word Lord to the New Testament 6 times when it is not found in any Greek text - for example: 1 Cor. 1:2; and 7:34. All this factual information is found by merely looking at their own NIV complete concordance.

Apparently the scholarly views of Mr. Kutilek are not shared by others members of the Bible of the Month Club. Perhaps Mr. Kutilek should write his own bible version to give us the true light we benighted souls have so long pined for these many years now ☺)

Mr. Kutilek, and fellow Bible critics are like those described in I Timothy 1:7 "Desiring to be teachers...understanding neither what they say, nor whereof they affirm."

By the rigid standard he sets up, he himself condemns all bible versions in print. He criticizes the KJB for translating me genoito as God forbid, yet the lexicons, including Thayer, [Liddell] & Scott, and Baer, Arndt & Gingrich all tell us this is a perfectly acceptable way of rendering this expression. There are a whole host of Bible versions both before and after the King James Bible that do the very same thing, including some that Mr. Kutilek himself recommends!

Words of advice from Proverbs for those who think Mr. Kutilek has a handle on the truth. "Go from the presence of a foolish man, when thou perceivest not in him the lips of knowledge." Proverbs 14:7

Will Kinney

Good advice for Grievous Wolf, ***"a companion of fools"*** Proverbs 13:20.

Leviticus 6:21; 8:28; 17:6; 23:18 ***"sweet savour"***

Grievous Wolf states *""soothing aroma" (KJV appeals to wrong senses - taste instead of smell in the TR)."*

Will Kinney has an excellent article on the expression ***"sweet savour."***

See brandplucked.webs.com/smelledasweetsavor.htm and www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/ *Will Kinney's articles on the AV issue.* Extracts from Will Kinney's article follow.

God smelled a sweet savour

The LORD smelled A SWEET SAVOUR

In Genesis 8:20 through 21 we read of a phrase that is often found in the King James Bible - a sweet savour.

"And Noah builded an altar unto the LORD; and took of every clean beast, and of every clean fowl, and offered burnt offerings on the altar. And the LORD smelled A SWEET SAVOUR; and the LORD said in his heart, I will not again curse the ground any more for man's sake; for the imagination of man's heart is evil from his youth..."

At one of the Bible discussion clubs a Bible critic said the phrase "sweet savour" in the King James Bible, such as is found in Genesis 8:21, Leviticus 6:21, 8:28 and many other places, is wrong because it appeals to the sense of taste rather than smell. He said the phrase should be "a soothing aroma" as is found in versions like the NKJV, NASB, Holman and NIV.

Is there any merit to what this "Bible scholar" says or is he just another pompous gas bag who reveals his ignorance and unbelief by such silly statements? I guess you can already tell what my conclusion is.

First of all, this guy needs to learn his own ENGLISH language. Any schoolboy can get an English dictionary and look up the word SAVOUR, or savor. Webster's Dictionary defines savor as "a particular TASTE or SMELL", and "the quality in a substance that affects the sense of TASTE OR SMELL."

The American Heritage Dictionary defines "savor" as "The taste OR SMELL of something."

The Cambridge Dictionary of the English language defines savor as: "A SMELL or taste, especially a pleasant one."

It is amazing how a little study of the English language can clear things up for those who have been dumbed down by the modern American education system.

Secondly, not only does the King James Bible render this word as "sweet SAVOUR" in Genesis 8:21 and the other passages but so also do the following Bible versions: Tyndale 1534 (he translated Genesis before his death), Coverdale 1535, The Great Bible 1540, Matthew's Bible (John Rogers) 1549, Bishops' Bible 1568, the Lesser Bible 1853, the Revised Version 1881, American Standard Version 1901, the Jewish translations of 1917, 1936, Webster's 1833, Douay 1950, Lamsa's 1933 translation of the Syriac Peshitta, World English Bible, Hebrew Names Version, KJV 21st Century Version, and the Third Millennium Bible.

Thirdly, a very important connection is lost in the modern versions when they refer to the Old Testament sacrifices like that in Genesis 8:21 as a "pleasing aroma" (NIV) or "a soothing aroma" (NKJV, NASB) instead of a "sweet savour", and how they all point to Christ as the ultimate sacrifice.

In Ephesians 5:2 in the King James Bible we read: "And walk in love, as Christ also hath loved us, and hath given himself for us an offering and a sacrifice to God for A SWEETSMELLING SAVOUR." The King James Bible consistently refers to the O.T.

sacrifices as God SMELLING a "sweet savour" and to Christ as their ultimate fulfilment as a "sweetsmelling SAVOUR".

"SWEETSMELLING SAVOUR" is also found in Ephesians 5:2 in the following Bible translations: Tyndale 1525, Coverdale 1535, Bishops' Bible 1568, the Geneva Bible 1599, Wesley's translation 1755, Webster's translation 1833, Darby 1870, the KJV 21st Century 1994 and the Third Millennium Bible 1998.

But this connection between the Old Testament sacrifices and the sacrifice of Christ both being "a sweet smelling savour" is obscured in most modern versions.

The NKJV has "a soothing aroma" in Genesis 8:21 but Christ as "a sweet smelling aroma" in Ephesians 5:2.

The NASB has "a soothing aroma" in Genesis 8:21 but Christ as "a fragrant aroma" in Ephesians 5:2.

The NIV and Holman Standard have "a pleasing aroma" in Genesis 8:21 but Christ as "a fragrant offering" in Ephesians.

The King James Bible is right as always, and this Bible critic would do much better to learn his own English language first rather than running around posting his nonsense.

That is more good advice for Grievous Wolf.

1 Kings 20:38 ***"ashes upon his face"***

Grievous Wolf states *"bandage over his eyes" (KJV varies from TR by using ashes)."*

Grievous Wolf fails to explain how a man *"with a bandage over his eyes"* is supposed to see the king when he goes by and obey an order to keep watch on a hostage, according to 1 Kings 20:39.

"And as the king passed by, he cried unto the king: and he said, Thy servant went out into the midst of the battle; and, behold, a man turned aside, and brought a man unto me, and said, Keep this man: if by any means he be missing, then shall thy life be for his life, or else thou shalt pay a talent of silver."

Will Kinney has an excellent article on the expression ***"ashes upon his face."***

See brandplucked.webs.com/1kings2038ashesonface.htm and www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/ *Will Kinney's articles on the AV issue*. Extracts from Will Kinney's article follow.

1 Kings 20:38 ashes upon his face

In 1 Kings 20:38 we read in the King James Holy Bible: "So the prophet departed, and waited for the king by the way, and disguised himself with ASHES UPON HIS FACE."

The NKJV along with the NASB, Holman Standard, RSV, NRSV, ESV says: "Then the prophet departed and waited by the road, and disguised himself with A BANDAGE OVER HIS EYES."

The NIV has: "He disguised himself with HIS HEADBAND DOWN OVER HIS EYES."

The New Century Version says "The prophet WRAPPED HIS FACE IN A CLOTH"...

The word for "ashes" is number 666 aphehr and is found only two times in the Hebrew texts. The other time is in verse 41 where it says "he hasted, and took the ASHES away from his face; and the king of Israel discerned him that he was of the prophets."

According to Wigram's Hebrew Concordance and Strong's, this word # 666 comes from # 665 ehpher meaning "ashes" and is used in such places as Genesis 18:27 where Abraham says: "Behold now, I have taken upon me to speak unto the Lord, which am but dust and ASHES" and where Job says in Job 42:6 "Wherefore I abhor myself, and repent in dust and ASHES."

Not only does the King James Bible tell us that the prophet disguised himself with ASHES upon his face, but so also do the following Bible versions: Wycliffe 1395 " he chaungide his mouth and iyen, by sprynging of dust", Tyndale 1530, Coverdale 1535, The Great Bible (Cranmer) 1540, Matthew's Bible (John Rogers) 1549, the Bishops' Bible 1568, the Geneva Bible 1599...the 2004 Spanish Reina Valera Gomez translation = the KJB saying "y se disfrazó poniendo ceniza sobre su rostro.", the 1681 Portuguese de Almeida says "ashes upon his eyes" – "e disfarçou-se com cinza sobre os seus olhos" and the 2006 French KJV – "et se déguisa avec de la poussière sur son visage."

If a Bible critic comes along who says the King James Bible is in error for telling us the prophet disguised himself "with ashes upon his face", he then places his own mere opinion against many other men just as learned and knowledgeable, if not much more so, as he is, who disagree with him and affirm the Authorized rendering to be correct.

Commentators as well as the multitude of Bible versions all offer different and conflicting opinions. What one affirms another categorically denies. The thing to remember is that no Bible commentator, no modern Bible translator, and no self-appointed King James Bible critic believes that any Bible on this earth is the complete, inerrant, inspired words of God. Every man does that which is right in his own eyes.

I and thousands of other Bible believers will continue to maintain that God has given us His perfect and preserved words of truth, and that for the last 400 years they have been found in the King James Holy Bible.

Will Kinney

As indicated above, Grievous Wolf, like all other critics of the 1611 Holy Bible, has no final authority between two covers but merely recommends "*multiple translations.*" See **Introduction**.

2 Samuel 6:19; 1 Chronicles 16:3; Song of Solomon 2:5; Hosea 3:1 ***"flagon"***

Grievous Wolf overlooked this word in his table but it has been included from the original table for completeness.

The objection from the original table is as follows.

"These verses contain the word "flagon" which is a fluted cup from which liquid is drunk. However, the Hebrew word is "ashishah" which has always meant raisins or raisin cakes. This is especially true in Hos 3:1 because raisin cakes were often offered to idols. This is an obvious error in translation."

Will Kinney has an excellent article on the word ***"flagon."***

See brandplucked.webs.com/hosea3flagonsofwine.htm and www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/ *Will Kinney's articles on the AV issue*. Extracts from Will Kinney's article follow.

"flagons of wine" or "raisin cakes"?

Hosea 3:1 "flagons of wine" or "raisin cakes"?

At a well known anti-King James Bible site the bible agnostics have put together a laundry list of what they call "Indisputable, universally recognized errors in the KJV". You can see it here if you like.

http://www.bible.ca/b-kjv-only.htm#errors/

Every one of them has been examined and shot down as being pure silliness and baseless ignorance. Found among this laundry list is the word "baptism" that this particular Bible corrector thinks is an error found throughout the entire New Testament. Apparently he is unaware that almost every translation ever made, including the modern ones like the NKJV, NIV, NASB, ESV, NET, Holman etc. all read "baptism".

Another one is where he tells us that the TR (Textus Receptus) does not read a certain way in Leviticus. He says: "sweet savour" Lev 6:21; 8:28; 17:6; 23:18 "soothing aroma" (KJV appeals to wrong senses- taste instead of smell in the TR).

Apparently this self appointed expert is blissfully unaware of the fact that the TR has absolutely nothing to do with the Old Testament, and is abysmally ignorant of his own English language.

See the refutation of this ridiculous claim of "error in the KJV" here:

http://brandplucked.webs.com/smelledasweetsavor.htm/

This particular Bible study will focus on his alleged error found in Hosea 3:1 where the King James Bible says "flagons of wine" and versions such as the NKJV, NIV, NASB, ESV have "raisin cakes".

This Bible corrector writes: "flagon" 2 Sam 6:19; 1 Chron 16:3; SoS 2:5; Hosea 3:1. These verses contain the word "flagon" which is a fluted cup from which liquid is drunk. However, the Hebrew word is "ashishah" which has always meant raisins or raisin cakes. This is especially true in Hos 3:1 because raisin cakes were often offered to idols. This is an obvious error in translation."

Let's take a closer look to see if there is any merit to his claims or if he is just another Bible Babble Buffet promoter who has set up his own mind and understanding as his final authority.

The King James Bible says: "Then said the LORD unto me, Go yet, love a woman beloved of her friend, yet an adulteress, according to the love of the LORD toward the children of Israel, who look to other gods, and love FLAGONS OF WINE."

The context of the whole book of Hosea would suggest that this is the best way to translate this Hebrew phrase. Notice Hosea 2:8 "For she did not know that I gave her corn, and ***wine,*** *and oil, and multiplied her silver and gold,* ***which they prepared for Baal."*** *4:11 "Whoredom and* ***wine and new wine*** *take away the heart." and Hosea 7:5 "In the day of our king the princes have made him sick with* ***bottles of wine;*** *he stretched out his hand with scorners." and 7:14 "And they have not cried unto me with their heart, when they howled upon their beds:* ***they assemble themselves for corn and wine, and they rebel against me.*** *[Hosea 9:2 and 4] "The floor and the* ***winepress*** *shall not feed them, and the* ***new wine*** *shall fail in her...They shall not offer* ***wine*** *offerings to the LORD, neither shall they be pleasing unto him."*

The NKJV reads [in Hosea 3:1]: "Then the LORD said to me, "Go again, love a woman who is loved by a lover and is committing adultery, just like the love of the LORD for the children of Israel, who look to other gods and love THE RAISIN CAKES OF THE PAGANS." (The words "of the pagans" are not found in any text.)

Daniel Wallace and company have "and love to offer raisin cakes to idols." (Again, the words "offer" and "to idols" are not in any text.)

The NASB, ESV and Holman say "raisin cakes" and the NIV has "sacred raisin cakes"...

First of all, it should be pointed out that the word found in the Hebrew texts and the King James Bible for "wine" as in "flagons of wine" is geh-nahv...and is translated as either grapes or wine, but not raisins. The word for raisins is an entirely different Hebrew word (tzim-moo-keem...) and is found only 4 times and every time translated as "clusters of raisins" or "bunches of raisins" in 1 Samuel 25:18; 30:12, 2 Samuel 16:1 and 1 Chronicles 12:40.

The other word is where all the scholars go their separate ways and some translate it one way and others another and they do not agree with each other, as we shall soon see.

The Hebrew word translated as "flagons" in the King James Bible and in MANY other translations both in English and in foreign languages, is found only 4 times - 2 Samuel 6:19, 1 Chronicles 16:3, Song of Solomon 2:5 and here in Hosea 3:1. It is the word ashee-shah...

Among the Bible translations that agree with the sense of the King James Bible in Hosea 3:1 and the other places (Some have "wine bottles" and others "wine pots" and some "flagons of wine") are the following Bible translations: Wycliffe 1395, Coverdale 1535, the Great Bible 1540, Matthew's Bible 1549, the Bishop's Bible 1568, the Geneva Bible 1587...the 2004 Hebrew Complete Tanach reads: "and love goblets of grapes." the 2008 Torah Transliteration Scripture reads "and love flagons of wine"...

See this modern 2004 Hebrew translation online. It is called The Jewish Study Bible and it translates Hosea 3:1 as "and love the cups of the grape" - notice "cups" and not "raisins", but "cups of the grape".

http://books.google.com/books?id=aDuy3p5QvEYC/

See this independent Hebrew translation of the Massoretic text done in 1853 by Isaac Lesser. Hosea 3:1 reads exactly like the King James Bible with "and love flagons of wine."

http://www.archive.org/details/twentyfourbookso1853lees/

Among foreign language translation that agree with the King James Bible's "flagons of wine" are Luther's German Bible of 1545 - "Kanne Wein" = "cans of wine", the Spanish Sagradas Escrituras of 1569, the Spanish Reina Valera 1865, Reina Valera of 1909, and the Reina Valera Gomez of 2004 - "y aman frascos de vino", the Italian Conferenza Episcopale Italiana, the Italian Diodati 1649, the Riveduta 1927, the Nuova Diodati 1991- "ed amano le schiacciate d'uva.", the French Martin of 1744 and the modern French KJB - "aiment les flacons de vin." and the Modern Greek translation - "και αγαπωσι φιαλας οινου." = love flagons of wine.

The Bible Commentators

***John Calvin** translates as does the King James Bible's "flagons" and he comments: "And they love flagons of grapes. The Prophet, I doubt not, compares this rage to drunkenness."*

***Adam Clarke** - "The flagons of wine were probably such as were used for libations, or drunk in idol feasts."*

***John Wesley** tersely comments: "Love the feasts of their idols, where they drink wine to excess."*

***The Geneva Bible** included a running commentary and says: "That is, gave themselves wholly to pleasure, and could not stop, as those that are given to drunkenness."*

Matthew Henry *comments: "And they loved flagons of wine; they joined with idolaters because they lived merrily and drank hard; they had a kindness for other gods for the sake of the plenty of good wine with which they had been sometimes treated in their temples. Idolatry and sensuality commonly go together; those that make a god of their belly, as drunkards do, will easily be brought to make a god of [anything else]. God's priests were to drink no wine when they went in to minister, and his Nazarites none at all. But the worshippers of other gods drank wine in bowls; nay, no less than flagons of wine would content them."*

Matthew Poole *in his Commentary on the whole Bible says regarding Hosea 3:1 - "Love flagons of wine; loved the feasts of their idols, where they drank wine to excess, by too great measures, which, without dispute, was usual in the idol feasts, Amos ii. 8; 1 Cor. x. 21; or else these flagons of wine speak their loose, drunken, and riotous living."*

<u>More about "flagons of wine"</u>

2 Samuel 6:19 "a cake of bread, a good piece of flesh, and a flagon of wine"

with 1 Chronicles 16:3 "a loaf of bread, and a good piece of flesh, and a flagon of wine"

Both 2 Samuel 6:19 and 1 Chronicles 16:3 relate the same events when king David and all the house of Israel "brought up the ark of the LORD and set it in its place, in the midst of the tabernacle David had pitched for it." David danced with all his might before the LORD and after he had offered up burnt offerings and peace offerings we read that "he dealt among all the people, even among the whole multitude of Israel, as well to the women as men, to every one A CAKE OF BREAD, AND A GOOD PIECE OF FLESH, AND A FLAGON OF WINE."

BOTH places refer to the same event and in both places in the King James Bible we read of the same three things being distributed to the people - 1. a loaf of bread, 2. a good piece of flesh (meat) and 3. a flagon of wine.

So read not only the King James Bible but so also the following Bible translations: the Great Bible 1540 (Cranmer) - "to euerye one a Cake of breed, & a pece of fleshe, & a flasket of drincke.", Matthew's Bible 1549, the Bishops' Bible 1568, the Geneva Bible 1587 - "to euerie one a cake of bread, and a piece of flesh, and a bottell of wine."...[a] modern Jewish translation called the Complete Tanach 2004 reads like the KJB with "to each individual a loaf of bread, and a portion of meat, and a barrel of wine." Martin Luther's 1545 German Bible reads like the KJB - "einem jeglichen einen Brotkuchen und ein Stück Fleisch und ein halbes Maß Wein." The Spanish Sagradas Escrituras of 1569, the old Spanish Reina Valera of 1909 and the 2004 Reina Valera Gomez translation all read exactly like the King James Bible - "Y repartió á todo Israel, así á hombres como á mujeres, á cada uno una torta de pan, y una pieza de carne, y un frasco de vino." The 1744 French Martin bible reads like the KJB - "tant aux hommes qu'aux femmes, à chacun un gâteau, une pièce de chair, et une bouteille de vin"., the 1649 Italian Diodati - "una focaccia di pane, ed un pezzo di carne, ed un fiasco di vino per uno." as does the Modern Greek translation - "εις εκαστον ανθρωπον εν ψωμιον και εν τμημα κρεατος <u>και μιαν φιαλην οινου.</u>"

However many modern versions give us very conflicting readings about what three things king David distributed among the people, with some, like the NASBs, even conflicting among themselves.

The NASB reads: "a cake of bread AND ONE OF DATES and one of raisins to each one." in 2 Samuel 6:19 but in relating the exact same events in 1 Chronicles 16:3 it tells us that David "distributed to everyone of Israel, both man and woman, to everyone a loaf of bread AND A PORTION OF MEAT and a raisin cake."

The NIV, on the other hand, tell us in 1 Chronicles 16:3 AND in 2 Samuel 6:19 that king David distributed "a loaf of bread, A CAKE OF DATES and a cake of raisins" in BOTH accounts. So the NASB tells us in the 2 Samuel account that it was "a cake of dates" and yet in 1 Chronicles 16:3 it changes it to "a portion of meat".

However the NKJV tells us that king David gave out to the people " to everyone a loaf of bread, A PIECE OF MEAT, and a cake of raisins." in both accounts. So, not one of these three modern versions recommended by the likes of James White agree either with the time tested King James Bible nor with each other!

More on 2 Samuel 6:19

...The ESV 2001 differs from both the NASB and the NIV in 2 Samuel 6:19 saying it was: "a cake of bread, A PORTION OF MEAT, and a cake of raisins to each one"...

Bible agnostics and "scholars" will continue to disagree with each other and each man will set up his own mind and understanding as his final authority, but the Bible believer is convinced that God has indeed preserved His complete and infallible words in the greatest Bible ever put in print, carried to the far ends of the earth and believed by thousands to be the 100% true words of God - the King James Holy Bible.

Will Kinney

All 10 of Grievous Wolf's 'errors' in the 1611 Holy Bible that he tabulated together with an eleventh 'error' that he forgot to tabulate have been found to be errors on the part of Grievous Wolf and other anti-Biblicists such as Gary Hudson, Doug Kutilek, James White et al.

This work will continue with further 'errors' in the 1611 Holy Bible that Grievous Wolf insists that he has identified.

Exodus 32:14, Jeremiah 18:8, 10, Amos 7:6, Jonah 3:1 ***"repent"***

Grievous Wolf thinks that ***"repent"*** should be changed to *"relent"* as in the NKJV etc.

See **Appendix** for Grievous Wolf's tortuous explanation after his citation of Jeremiah 18:7-10 of why he thinks ***"repent"*** is wrong and *"relent"* is right. As usual, however, the 1611 Holy Bible is right and Grievous Wolf is wrong, together with the NKJV and other modern versions that change ***"repent"*** to *"relent."*

"Repent" in the 1611 Holy Bible means to turn back either in thought or act or both, not do what was intended or do the *opposite* of what has or had been done. Note the first four occurrences of the word ***"repent"*** in scripture or one of its derivatives that cover those three meanings, including Exodus 32:14 that Grievous Wolf cites. ***"Repent"*** also has the sense of grief or remorse for what has been done and is a *heart* response.

"And it repented the LORD that he had made man on the earth, and it grieved him at his heart. And the LORD said, I will destroy man whom I have created from the face of the earth; both man, and beast, and the creeping thing, and the fowls of the air; for it repenteth me that I have made them" Genesis 6:6-7.

"And it came to pass, when Pharaoh had let the people go, that God led them not through the way of the land of the Philistines, although that was near; for God said, Lest peradventure the people repent when they see war, and they return to Egypt:" Exodus 13:17.

"Wherefore should the Egyptians speak, and say, For mischief did he bring them out, to slay them in the mountains, and to consume them from the face of the earth? Turn from thy fierce wrath, and repent of this evil against thy people" Exodus 32:12.

"And the LORD repented of the evil which he thought to do unto his people" Exodus 32:14.

See also the consistency of the 1611 Holy Bible with respect to the meanings of word ***"repent"*** mentioned above in Jeremiah 18:8, 10, Amos 7:6, Jonah 3:10 that Grievous Wolf cites.

"If that nation, against whom I have pronounced, turn from their evil, I will repent of the evil that I thought to do unto them...If it do evil in my sight, that it obey not my voice, then I will repent of the good, wherewith I said I would benefit them."

"The LORD repented for this: This also shall not be, saith the Lord GOD."

"And God saw their works, that they turned from their evil way; and God repented of the evil, that he had said that he would do unto them; and he did it not."

The NKJV and other new versions that use *"relent"* instead of ***"repent"*** are wrong because they self-contradict in Exodus 32:14, Amos 7:6, Jonah 3:10, Jeremiah 18:8, 10 because *"relent"* does *not* mean to turn back in either thought or act, not do what was intended or do the *opposite* of what has or had been done. Neither the word *"relent"* nor any of its derivatives occur in the 1611 Holy Bible but *The Concise Oxford Dictionary* gives its primary meaning as to relax severity, that is, its meaning is *not*:

- to turn back in either thought or act,
- refrain from doing what was intended
- do the *opposite* of what has or had been done.

Will Kinney has an excellent article on the word ***"repent."***

See brandplucked.webs.com/godrepents.htm and www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/ *Will Kinney's articles on the AV issue*. Extracts from Will Kinney's article follow, additional comments in braces [].

Can God "repent"?

There are many Bible Correctors out there today who try to tell us that the King James Bible is in error for translating the Hebrew Scriptures in such a way as to suggest that God can "repent".

First of all, let it be noted that not only does the King James Bible say that God "repented", as in Genesis 6:6 "And it REPENTED the LORD that he had made man on the earth, and it grieved him at his heart" but so also do the following Bible translations: Wycliffe 1395, Coverdale 1535, the Great Bible 1540, Matthew's Bible 1549, the Bishops' Bible 1568, Geneva Bible 1599...the Spanish Reina Valera 1909, 1960, 1995 (se arrepintió), the Italian Diodati 1649 and the New Diodati 1991 - "si pentì di aver fatto l'uomo sulla terra", the French Martin 1744, French Louis Segond 1910 and the French Ostervald 1991 - "Se repentit d'avoir fait l'homme sur la terre", and the Portuguese Almeida...

I have run into several of these men who criticize the King James Bible reading of "it repented the Lord that..." and have had opportunity to discuss the Bible version issue with some of them. What I have found without exception is that not one of these men believes that ANY Bible in ANY language found in print today IS now the complete and inerrant words of God. One such man is Dr. Jason Gastrich who likes to list some 50 places where he thinks the King James Bible (and ALL bibles out there) are in error. Many of Dr. Gastrich's "errors" are shared by even the NKJV, NIV, NASB, RSV, ESV, Holman and ALL bible versions in existence. What he has done is what all others do who do not believe The Book -

they each make themselves their own final authority and don't agree with anybody else 100% of the time...

Modern bible versions like the NKJV and NASB, which frequently translate this Hebrew word as something other than "repent" end up with the same "contradictions". For example, in 1 Samuel 15:29 the NKJV says: "the Strength of Israel will not lie nor RELENT. For He is not a man, that He should RELENT." The NASB tells us that "He is not a man that He SHOULD CHANGE HIS MIND." However both the NJKV and NASB type versions are then faced with a direct contradiction when they tell us in Exodus 32:12-14 that Moses asks God to RELENT (NASB - change Your mind) and then relate that God indeed "RELENTED from the harm which He said He would do" - NKJV (CHANGED HIS MIND - NASB).

Many commentators who are far from being King James Bible only believers have no problem correctly understanding what it means when the Bible says that God repented of certain things.

John Gill comments on Genesis 6:6 "and it repented the LORD" saying: "This is speaking by an anthropopathy, after the manner of men, because God determined to do, and did something similar to men, when they repent of anything: as a potter, when he has formed a vessel that does not please him, and he repents that he has made it, he takes it and breaks it in pieces; and so God, because of man's wickedness, and to show his aversion to it, and displicency [dislike, dissatisfaction, discontent] *at it, repented of his making him; that is, he resolved within himself to destroy him"...*

John Piper, certainly no King James Bible promoter writes: God Does Not Repent Like a Man, November 11, 1998...

"Now the question is: Does the Bible teach that God laments some of his decisions in the sense that I have described above (which does not imply that He is ignorant of their future consequences), or does the Bible teach that God laments some of his decisions because he did not see what was coming?

"The answer is given later in 1 Samuel 15. After God says in verse 11, "I repent that I have made Saul king," Samuel says in verse 29, as if to clarify, "The Strength of Israel will not lie nor repent: for he is not a man, that he should repent" (KJV). The point of this verse seems to be that, even though there is a sense in which God does repent (verse 11), there is another sense in which he does not repent (verse 29). The difference would naturally be that God's repentance happens in spite of perfect foreknowledge, while most human repentance happens because we lack foreknowledge. God's way of "repenting" is unique to God: "God is not a man that he should repent" (the way a man repents in his ignorance of the future).

"For God to say, "I feel sorrow that I made Saul king," is not the same as saying, "I would not make him king if I had it to do over." God is able to feel sorrow for an act in view of foreknown evil and pain, and yet go ahead and will to do it for wise reasons. And so later, when he looks back on the act, he can feel the sorrow for the act that was leading to the sad conditions, such as Saul's disobedience.

"Hence we have our precious fighter verse in Numbers 23:19 - "God is not a man, that He should lie, Nor a son of man, that He should repent; Has He said, and will He not do it? Or has He spoken, and will He not make it good?" I say it is precious, because here God's commitment to his promises hangs on his not repenting like a man. In other words, God's promises are not in jeopardy, because God can foresee all circumstances, he knows that nothing will occur that will cause him to take them back. Resting in the confidence of God's all-knowing promises, - Pastor John"

The King James Bible is right, as always.

Will Kinney

Exodus 20:13 ***"kill"***

Grievous Wolf thinks that ***"kill"*** should be *"murder"* as in the NKJV and 'the Hebrew.' He also has a rant about Bible believers who *"worship a translation."* It has of course been shown repeatedly in these responses to Grievous Wolf that he worships two-and-a-half pints of human brains. See www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/james-white-dr-divietro-and-dawaite.php, *Answers to the Wolf-Man*, **Introduction**.

Grievous Wolf should reflect carefully on Colossians 3:12.

"Put on therefore, as the elect of God, holy and beloved, bowels of mercies, kindness, humbleness of mind, meekness, longsuffering;"

Will Kinney has an excellent article on the word ***"kill."***

See brandplucked.webs.com/exodus2013notkill.htm and www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/ *Will Kinney's articles on the AV issue*. Extracts from Will Kinney's article follow.

Exodus 20:13 and the KJB critics - "Thou shalt not kill."

There are those who argue that the King James Bible is in error for saying: "Thou shalt not kill." They insist it should be as the NKJV, NIV and NASB read with "You shall not murder."

It should be noted that ALL the versions, including the NKJV, NIV, and NASB, translate this same Hebrew word as "TO KILL" in other passages. One such example is found in Numbers 35:27. Throughout this chapter the same word found in Exodus 20:13, is used 16 times and variously translated as "kill, slayer, manslayer, murderer, and put to death."

In Numbers 35:26-27 we read: "But if the slayer shall at any time come without the border of the city of his refuge, whither he was fled; And the revenger of blood find him...and the revenger of blood KILL the slayer; he shall not be guilty of blood." The NIV, NKJV, NASB, ESV etc. all read: "the revenger of blood KILL the slayer".

Regarding Exodus 20:13, not only does the King James Bible read "Thou shalt not kill" but so also do Tyndale 1534 (he translated Exodus before his death), Coverdale 1535, The Great Bible 1540, Matthew's Bible 1549, Bishops' Bible 1568, the Geneva Bible 1599...the Spanish Reina Valera 1909, 1960, 1995, La Biblia de las Américas 1997 - "no matarás", the Portuguese Almeida "Não matarás.", the French Martin 1744, Louis Segond 1910 and the French Ostervald 1996 - "Tu ne tueras point.", the Italian Diodati 1649 and the New Diodati 1991 - "Non uccidere.", Luther's German Bible 1545 - "Du sollst nicht töten"...

Dr. Thomas Holland on Exodus 20:13 "Thou shalt not kill."

Modern Versions and the Sixth Commandment

Recently I have been asked about the sixth commandment, "Thou shalt not kill," as compared with the majority of contemporary versions, "You shall not murder" (Exodus 20:13 NIV). Because I have had this question before, I thought it might be well to address it for the student's consideration...

[T]hose who oppose the Authorized Version have stated that the KJV has mistranslated the Hebrew word "raw-tsakh" as "kill" when it really should be "murder" or that the word "murder" is a better translation. But is that really the case? It may come as a surprise to those who make such claims against the KJV that the weight of the evidence is against them.

First we must consider the Hebrew. As mentioned above the Hebrew word "raw-tsakh" is translated as "kill" and "murder" in the KJV. There are also several other words translated as "kill" or "murder" in the KJV. But this word carries the idea of dashing in pieces, to slay, or to do violence in an unjust manner that causes death. It is never applied to the slaying of animals, such as in a sacrifice. Nor is it used in regard to the taking of life in war.

However, those who insist that the KJV has mistranslated the word have a problem when we see how other versions translate it in various additional passages. For example, the word "raw-tsakh" in Exodus 20:13 (and Deut 5:17 where the commandments are repeated) stands in the future tense. The same word in the same tense appears again in Deuteronomy 4:42. The text reads, "That the slayer might flee thither, which should kill his neighbour unawares, and hated him not in times past; and that fleeing unto one of these cities he might live."

If the KJV is incorrect in its translation of "raw-tsakh" as "kill" and the NIV has corrected it as "murder" in Exodus 20:13, then we would expect this same Hebrew word that the KJV "mistranslates" to be "corrected" in Deuteronomy 4:42 as well. However, the NIV reads in this passage, "to which anyone who had killed a person could flee if he had unintentionally killed his neighbor without malice aforethought. He could flee into one of these cities and save his life." So do the NKJV, RSV, ESV.

If translating "raw-tsakh" in the future tense as "kill" is wrong in Exodus 20:13, then it is also wrong in Deuteronomy 4:42, but there modern versions translate it as "kill." Why? Because the word can be translated either way; either one is therefore a correct translation.

Second, the same is true of the New Testament. In Matthew 5:21, the KJV states, "Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time, Thou shalt not kill; and whosoever shall kill shall be in danger of the judgment." Clearly the Lord is quoting from the Ten Commandments. Here the Greek word used is "phoneuseis" a form of the word "phoneuw" and again means "to kill, slay, murder" (Thayer's Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament). This Greek word appears several times in the New Testament and is translated as "kill" (Matt. 5:21; 23:31; Mark 10:19; Luke 18:20; Rom. 13:9; James 2:11; 4:2; and 5:6). However, it is also translated as "murder" in Matthew 19:18 and as "slew" in Matthew 23:35.

If the KJV was incorrect with the Hebrew by translating it as "kill" in Exodus 20:13, we must say that it is also incorrect when translating the Greek word in Matthew 5:21 as "kill." However, as with the Old Testament Hebrew word, modern versions translate the Greek "phoneuw" as both "murder" and "kill." Yet in James 4:2 the NIV translates this Greek word as "kill." Again, this demonstrates that it means either.

Finally, we come to the English. Both my 1828 and 1975 Webster Dictionaries inform me that the word "kill" means, "to deprive of life." The word "murder" means, "the crime of unlawfully killing a person." Both can be used interchangeably, in that it is impossible to murder a person without killing them. However, there are those who still object to the phrase, "thou shalt not kill" insisting that it must be "you shall not murder." Therefore, so they state, modern versions have clarified the difference for us. But have they really?

The English word "kill" means to deprive of life. The word "murder" means to unlawfully kill a person." Therefore, by English definitions, the word murder involves an unlawful act. However, if it is lawful it would not be murder to deprive someone of life. With this in mind, I certainly think the phrase "thou shalt not kill" is much better. For this simple reason, abortion is the law of the land. It is not illegal for a doctor to deprive a living child of its life if the mother consents to this act. I can almost hear the liberal theologian justifying abortion on the grounds that it is not murder because it is not unlawful. The same may be said of euthanasia. While it is not the law of our land yet, it is the law of the land in many countries

and it not an unlawful act in those nations. Nevertheless, both acts deprive a living being of their life. Both acts KILL. With this in mind, which do you think is really the better translation?

Yours in Christ Jesus, Dr. Thomas Holland...

[Genesis 4:8, 27:41, 34:25-26, 37:20, Exodus 21:14] are just a few of many examples found in the modern versions where the clear act of "murder" is referred to as "killing". The King James Bible is not in error in Exodus 20:13 and the Bible critics have not done their homework. It can rightly be said of the KJB critics as of other false teachers: "understanding neither what they say, nor whereof they affirm." 1 Timothy 1:7.

Will Kinney

Objections raised:

Re: Exodus 20:13 Thou shalt not kill

http://groups.yahoo.com/group/versions/message/4459

This objection was raised at a Bible club by a Whateverist who opposes the KJB.

"Both you and Dr. Holland skip the obvious thing here, Will. Dr.Holland defines 'kill' as to end a life, for any reason, while murder is UNLAWFULLY killing another person. Therefore, by those definitions," thou shalt not kill" is a blanket prohibition against killing ANYTHING FOR ANY REASON.

Wherever else the Hebrew 'ratsach' is rendered "kill", there's a contextual indication that indicates the reason behind the killing, be it battle, the killing of a sacrificial animal, an execution, or murder. Exd.20:13 has no such contextual tag. Therefore, in this case, "murder" is the better rendering, since God was NOT forbidding any killing whatsoever. And murder is the act of wrongfilly [sic] *ending the life of another PERSON, and does NOT apply to the killing of animals. We see throughout the Bible that MURDER was the act forbidden by God.*

When we see how often this one little verse from the KJV has been misused by the opponents of capital punishment and those trying to avoid military service, we should stop and think awhile."

My Response: Mr...., you have solved nothing by your way of defining words, but rather have created more problems than solutions. I know of many Christians who with a good conscience before God believe that to kill another person for any reason whatsoever is murder. They believe that for the state to kill a killer (or to kill the murderer) is still murder. You are guilty of doing the very act you are condemning the murderer for. Many Christians likewise believe any act of war whereby a Christian is called upon to kill another human being is still murder. They even have a lot of Scripture to back up their views.

"Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you, and persecute you" Mat. 5:44.

"Ye have heard that it hath been said, An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth: But I say unto you, That ye resist not evil; but whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also." Mat. 5:38-39.

"And the soldiers likewise demanded of him (John the Baptist), saying, And what shall we do? And he said unto them, Do violence to no man, neither accuse any falsely; and be content with your wages." Luke 3:14.

"My kingdom is not of this world; if my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight, that I should not be delivered to the Jews: but now is my kingdom not from hence." John 18:36.

"he that killeth with the sword must be killed with the sword. Here is the patience and the faith of the saints." Rev. 13:10.

"Then Jesus said unto him, Put up again thy sword into his place: for all they that take the sword shall perish with the sword." Mat. 26:52.

Many sincere Christians believe that to kill that other person whom you never met before and who has done nothing against you personally is an act of murder, even if your government tells you to do so. You have solved nothing by changing "Thou shalt not kill" to "you shall not murder".

If we take your definitions and use the modern versions you promote, then using the examples I listed, we can say that the sons of Jacob were not guilty of murder, they merely "killed" the people of Shechem. Why did they kill them? Because they raped their sister, but it wasn't "murder". So also Lamech just killed another man because he hit him first, but he didn't "murder" him. Joseph's brothers were not guilty of "murder" in their hearts. They only wanted to "kill" Joseph and they had a right to do so because they were envious. And then of course the act of "killing babies" is OK because they are not really "murdering" them. Murder is against the law and abortion is legal, so it is merely "killing babies", not "murdering" them.

Mr...., the KJB and all the other versions I listed are not wrong for saying "Thou shalt not kill". No matter which version you use, you still have to use some common sense and compare Scripture with Scripture to find out the intended meaning of the passage, and still some Christians will not reach the same conclusions as others.

Will Kinney

The simplest view of Exodus 20:13 is in the verse itself.

"Thou shalt not kill."

It is *God* Who determines when there is ***"a time to kill"*** Ecclesiastes 3:3 e.g. Genesis 9:5, 6, Numbers 35:30, Deuteronomy 17:6, 19:1-13, Acts 25:11, not ***"thou."***

Numbers 23:22, 24:8, 39:9 ***"unicorn"***

Grievous Wolf thinks that ***"unicorn"*** should be changed to *"wild ox"* as in the NKJV.

Isaiah 13:21 ***"satyrs"***

Grievous Wolf thinks that ***"satyrs"*** should be *"wild goats"* as in the NKJV.

See www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/james-white-dr-divietro-and-dawaite.php, *Answers to the Wolf-Man* with respect to Grievous Wolf's *Question 21*.

Why would the Holy Spirit misguide the translators to employ the use of mythical creatures like "unicorn" for wild ox, "satyr" for "wild goat"...when in 1611 and today we know what the real names of these creatures are?

This writer's answer follows.

The Holy Spirit did not misguide the translators at all. By what authority does Grievous Wolf determine that the creatures that he lists are mythical and again, who is *"we"* to whom he is referring? Again, Grievous Wolf does not say. In spite of posing *Question 21*, he

clearly expects that his dogma and that of his unidentified cohorts should be accepted *without* question.

Job 12:2 comes to mind.

"No doubt but ye are the people, and wisdom shall die with you."

Concerning the creatures mentioned, Grievous Wolf appears unable to appreciate that they may be both natural and *super*natural...

Concerning the term *"satyr,"* it occurs twice in the 1611 Holy Bible, each time in the plural.

"But wild beasts of the desert shall lie there; and their houses shall be full of doleful creatures; and owls shall dwell there, and satyrs shall dance there" Isaiah 13:21.

"The wild beasts of the desert shall also meet with the wild beasts of the island, and the satyr shall cry to his fellow; the screech owl also shall rest there, and find for herself a place of rest" Isaiah 34:14.

If the King's men had wanted to use the term *"wild goat"* instead of *"satyr,"* they could have done so. See Deuteronomy 14:5, 1 Samuel 24:2, Job 39:1, Psalm 104:18. Note in passing that Deuteronomy 14:5 includes the only reference in scripture to ***"the wild ox."*** This reference is significant with respect to the term *"unicorn"* that will be discussed below.

That the King's men did not substitute the term *"wild goat"* for *"satyr"* indicates that God guided them to bring forth more revelation about ***"satyrs."***

Isaiah 13:21, 34:14 indicate that satyrs are associated with owls, which are unclean birds and therefore satyrs are associated with ***"devils"*** Revelation 18:1-2. See *Question 17*.

Satyrs are also associated with ***"wild beasts,"*** in particular ***"wild beasts of the desert"*** that are mentioned in both Isaiah 13:21 and Isaiah 34:14.

Note also Isaiah 13:22, showing that satyrs are associated with ***"dragons."***

"And the wild beasts of the islands shall cry in their desolate houses, and dragons in their pleasant palaces: and her time is near to come, and her days shall not be prolonged."

Five creatures are said to be ***"wild"*** in scripture; ***"the wild goat...the wild ox"*** Deuteronomy 14:5, the ***"wild roe"*** 2 Samuel 2:18, ***"the wild ass"*** Job 6:5, the ***"wild bull"*** Isaiah 51:20. As indicated above, ***"the wild goat"*** is mentioned a total of 4 times in scripture, Deuteronomy 14:5, 1 Samuel 24:2, Job 39:1, Psalm 104:18. The wild ox, roe, bull are each mentioned only once.

"The wild ass" in either the singular or plural form, with or without the definite article, is mentioned 11 times in scripture; Job 6:5, 11:2, 24:5, 39:5 twice, Psalm 104:11, Isaiah 32:14, Jeremiah 2:24, 14:6, Daniel 5:21, Hosea 8:9.

Note in particular the following references.

"Doth the wild ass bray when he hath grass? or loweth the ox over his fodder?" Job 6:5. ***"The wild ass"*** is said to ***"bray,"*** which is to cry. Of ***"the wild beasts"*** identified in scripture, only the noise of ***"the wild ass"*** is mentioned explicitly.

"For vain man would be wise, though man be born like a wild ass's colt" Job 11:12. Man is likened to ***"a wild ass's colt."***

"Behold, as wild asses in the desert, go they forth to their work; rising betimes for a prey: the wilderness yieldeth food for them and for their children" Job 24:5. The reference is to men, who are likened to wild asses.

"Because the palaces shall be forsaken; the multitude of the city shall be left; the forts and towers shall be for dens for ever, a joy of wild asses, a pasture of flocks;" Isaiah 32:14. Note the similarity with Isaiah 13:21, 22.

"And the wild asses did stand in the high places, they snuffed up the wind like dragons; their eyes did fail, because there was no grass" Jeremiah 14:6. Wild asses are likened to dragons. See again Isaiah 13:21, 22.

"And he was driven from the sons of men; and his heart was made like the beasts, and his dwelling was with the wild asses: they fed him with grass like oxen, and his body was wet with the dew of heaven; till he knew that the most high God ruled in the kingdom of men, and that he appointeth over it whomsoever he will" Daniel 5:21. A man is associated with ***"the wild asses."***

"For they are gone up to Assyria, a wild ass alone by himself: Ephraim hath hired lovers" Hosea 8:9. Men are associated with ***"a wild ass."***

Satyrs also dance. The word ***"dance"*** and its derivatives i.e. ***"dances," "dancing"*** occur a total of 21 times in scripture. Inspection of the references shows that apart from satyrs in Isaiah 13:21, only humans dance in scripture.

The above scriptures show that satyrs are associated with ***"devils," "dragons"*** and ***"wild beasts,"*** in particular ***"wild beasts of the desert."*** Satyrs ***"cry"*** as ***"wild beasts"*** do, ***"dance"*** as humans do and inhabit ***"desolate places"*** Job 3:14, Isaiah 13:21, 22.

Of the wild creatures identified in scripture, ***"the wild ass"*** is mentioned 11 times, more than all the other wild creatures combined. ***"The wild ass"*** is said to ***"bray"*** or cry and no other wild creature specified in scripture is identified by the sound that it makes. ***"The wild ass"*** is associated with ***"dragons," "the desert," "desolate places"*** and with men in 4 verses; Job 11:12, 24:5, Daniel 5:21, Hosea 8:9. The wild bull and the wild roe are each associated with men but only once, in the one reference in scripture where each of them occurs.

"Comparing spiritual things with spiritual" 1 Corinthians 2:13 therefore, the conclusion must be that ***"satyrs"*** are satanic monstrosities with attributes of both asses and humans and are therefore most likely the product of bestiality* practised by ***"the angels that sinned"*** 2 Peter 2:4 following the invasion by ***"the sons of God"*** Genesis 6:2 the result of which was that by the time of the flood, ***"all flesh had corrupted his way upon the earth"*** Genesis 6:12. *See Exodus 22:19, Leviticus 18:23, 20:15, 16, Deuteronomy 27:21.

The King's men were clearly ***"warned of God"*** Matthew 2:12 with respect to ***"satyrs"*** and rightly used the term in their work, especially as ***"the days of Noe"*** Luke 17:26 approach.

"Wild goat" is clearly not a proper translation for *"satyr."* Grievous Wolf is being wilfully ignorant, again.

Concerning the term *"unicorn,"* it occurs 9 times in scripture in both the singular and plural forms, Numbers 23:22, 24:8, Deuteronomy 33:17, Job 39:9, 10, Psalm 22:21, 29:6, 92:10, Isaiah 34:17.

The unicorn may typify an ox in some respects, as Numbers 22:4, 24:8 indicate.

"And Moab said unto the elders of Midian, Now shall this company lick up all that are round about us, as the ox licketh up the grass of the field. And Balak the son of Zippor was king of the Moabites at that time."

"God brought him forth out of Egypt; he hath as it were the strength of an unicorn: he shall eat up the nations his enemies, and shall break their bones, and pierce them through with his arrows."

Moreover, the unicorn is associated with bulls, bullocks and calves in scripture i.e. bovine creatures that illustrate the strength and agility of the unicorn.

"His glory is like the firstling of his bullock, and his horns are like the horns of unicorns: with them he shall push the people together to the ends of the earth: and they are the ten thousands of Ephraim, and they are the thousands of Manasseh" Deuteronomy 33:17.

"He maketh them also to skip like a calf; Lebanon and Sirion like a young unicorn" Psalm 29:6.

The unicorn is associated with strength in scripture, like the ox.

"God brought them out of Egypt; he hath as it were the strength of an unicorn" Numbers 23:22. Note again that Numbers 23:22 is the first mention of the unicorn in scripture and see also Numbers 24:8 above.

"That our oxen may be strong to labour; that there be no breaking in, nor going out; that there be no complaining in our streets" Psalm 144:14.

"Where no oxen are, the crib is clean: but much increase is by the strength of the ox" Proverbs 14:4.

However, the unicorn is not an ox, nor is it a wild ox.

As indicated above, Deuteronomy 14:5 shows that the King's men were aware of the expression ***"wild ox"*** but it is clearly not a substitute for ***"unicorn"*** because Deuteronomy 14:4 states that wild oxen can be *eaten*. Unicorns are never said to be available as human food.

Dr Gerardus D. Bouw states in *The Book of Bible Problems** p 238, that wild oxen can be tamed to serve human masters, for example by ploughing and harrowing fields. By contrast, Job 39:9-10 show that unicorns cannot be so tamed.

*Publisher: Association for Biblical Astronomy, 4527 Wetzel Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio, 44109, USA.

"Will the unicorn be willing to serve thee, or abide by thy crib? Canst thou bind the unicorn with his band in the furrow? or will he harrow the valleys after thee?"

The questions clearly imply negative answers, showing again that unicorns are not wild oxen.

As Dr Bouw also points out, Psalm 92:10 shows that a unicorn definitely has only one horn, unlike a wild ox.

"But my horn shalt thou exalt like the horn of an unicorn: I shall be anointed with fresh oil."

The strength of the unicorn Numbers 23:22, 24:8 may also be likened to ***"the strength of the horse"*** Psalm 147:10. The context of some of the verses that follow is a warning against trusting in chariots and horses instead of in ***"the name of the LORD our God"*** Psalm 20:7 for deliverance but they still emphasise the horse's strength, nevertheless.

"Hast thou given the horse strength? hast thou clothed his neck with thunder?" Job 39:19.

"An horse is a vain thing for safety: neither shall he deliver any by his great strength" Psalm 33:17.

"He delighteth not in <u>the strength of the horse</u>: he taketh not pleasure in the legs of a man" Psalm 147:10.

"Woe to them that go down to Egypt for help; <u>and stay on horses</u>, <u>and trust in chariots</u>, because they are many; <u>and in horsemen</u>, <u>because they are very strong</u>; but they look not unto the Holy One of Israel, neither seek the LORD!" Isaiah 31:1.

"<u>The snorting of his horses was heard from Dan</u>: <u>the whole land trembled at the sound of the neighing of his strong ones</u>; <u>for they are come</u>, <u>and have devoured the land</u>, <u>and all that is in it</u>; the city, and those that dwell therein" Jeremiah 8:16. Note the resemblance of Jeremiah 8:16 with Numbers 24:8.

"<u>At the noise of the stamping of the hoofs of his strong horses</u>, at the rushing of his chariots, and at the rumbling of his wheels, the fathers shall not look back to their children for feebleness of hands;" Jeremiah 47:10.

God has clearly alluded to oxen, calves and horses to depict unicorns but unicorns themselves are none of these creatures. Dr Bouw has this compelling observation, this writer's emphases.

"Sightings of unicorns date as recently as the eighteenth century. Recorded unicorn sightings come from India, Ethiopia, Abyssinia, Mecca, China, Persia, and even Canada. ***The description does not fit any animal alive today****, especially given that the horn is reported to be from two to three feet long. There is plenty of anecdotal evidence that these were real creatures. Sixteenth century accounts from Europe tell of unicorns in private zoos (there were no public zoos back then). There is no reason to doubt the reading in the Authorized Bible, especially given that the unicorn will return to earth when Christ comes from heaven (Is. 34:7). The implication is that they are extinct on earth at the time."*

As Dr Bouw notes, Psalm 22:21 and Isaiah 34:7 indicate that God has unicorns in heaven. Note again the association with cattle in Isaiah 34:7.

"Save me from the lion's mouth: <u>for thou hast heard me from the horns of the unicorns</u>."

"<u>And the unicorns shall come down with them</u>, and the bullocks with the bulls; and their land shall be soaked with blood, and their dust made fat with fatness."

Dr Ruckman notes in his commentary *Volume 1 of the Book of Psalms* p 136 on Psalm 22:21 that God's horses are ***"horses of fire"*** 2 Kings 2:11, 6:17. He adds that God heard the prayer of His Son in Psalm 22 ***"from the horns of the unicorns"*** *indicating that those unicorns must be in heaven*. They must therefore be the unicorns that come down from heaven in Isaiah 34:7. Note that according to the context, Isaiah 34:5 reveals that the coming down is from heaven *to inflict judgement on sinners who appear to be likened to cattle for the slaughter in Isaiah 34:6.* See Jeremiah 12:3, 50:27, 51:40, Zechariah 11:4, 7.

"For <u>my sword shall be bathed in heaven</u>: behold, <u>it shall come down upon Idumea</u>, <u>and upon the people of my curse, to judgment</u>."

Yet the animals that are explicitly mentioned as coming down from heaven at the Second Advent are horses, i.e. ***"horses of fire,"*** as Revelation 19:14 states.

"<u>And the armies which were in heaven followed him upon white horses</u>, clothed in fine linen, white and clean."

2 Kings 2:11, 6:17, Psalm 22:21, Isaiah 34:7, Revelation 19:14 therefore identify God's unicorns as ***"horses of fire"*** *with horns*.

The ***"them"*** in Isaiah 34:7 would appear to be indentified in Jude 14 in addition to Revelation 19:14.

"And Enoch also, the seventh from Adam, prophesied of these, saying, Behold, the Lord cometh with ten thousands of his saints,"

It would also appear that the strength of the unicorns in Isaiah 34:7 overcomes that of ***"the bullocks with the bulls"*** which are also part of the ***"great slaughter in the land of Idumea"*** Isaiah 34:6.

The above revelations from ***"comparing spiritual things with spiritual"*** 1 Corinthians 2:13 with respect to the term *"unicorn"* show that the modern alternative *"wild ox"* is a wholly inadequate substitute, like everything that Grievous Wolf has put forward so far.

Will Kinney has an informative article entitled *Satyrs, Dragons, Unicorns and Cockatrices* that is available at brandplucked.webs.com/satdragunicorns.htm. Bro. Kinney comes to a different conclusion about satyrs from that arrived at by this writer, which may be a useful brain-teaser for Mr Wolf.

In addition, Dr Paul E. Heaton has written a King James Bible-based study entitled *Unicorns and Dragons*, The Kings Publishing Company, 3297 Euclid Ave., Lupton, MI. 48635, preacher@m33access.com, that gives the scriptural position on unicorns, dragons, Leviathan, satyrs and witches.

It may be obtained from the Bible Baptist Bookstore, www.kjv1611.org/index.html.

James 2:3 ***"gay clothing"***

Grievous Wolf thinks that ***"gay clothing"*** should be *"fine clothes"* as in James 2:3.

See www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/james-white-dr-divietro-and-dawaite.php, *Answers to the Wolf-Man* with respect to Grievous Wolf's *Question 52*.

Is it possible that the rendition "gay clothing," in the KJV at James 2:3, could give the wrong impression to the modern-English KJV reader?

If it did, that is the reader's problem, not the problem of the 1611 Holy Bible. Grievous Wolf evidently can't tell the difference. He also forgot to read James 2:2 that defines ***"gay clothing"*** in James 2:3.

"For if there come unto your assembly a man with a gold ring, in goodly apparel, and there come in also a poor man in vile raiment;"

"Gay clothing" is ***"goodly apparel"*** i.e. expensive clothing worn by a rich man who can afford ***"a gold ring."*** Wolf is being wilfully ignorant again, 1 Corinthians 14:38. See *Questions 4, 6, 7, 12, 13, 15, 16, 19, 21, 24, 25, 38, 46*.

The final sections of this work will answer Grievous Wolf's complaints about so-called hard-to-understand 'archaisms' in the 1611 Holy Bible that supposedly need *"an old dictionary at your side"* (see **Appendix**, **ARCHAIC LANGUAGE**) and that in his ill-considered opinion therefore limit the Gospel to the supposedly *"well-educated."*

The 'Hard-to-Understand' 1611 Holy Bible

Grievous Wolf's statement to this effect is sheer hypocrisy. See the **Introduction** with respect to Wolf's recommendation of *"multiple translations"* and Dr Mrs Riplinger's accompanying statement that highlights Grievous Wolf's hypocrisy.

"It is scandalous for rich Americans to have ten versions of the bible, instead of just one...Many tribes and peoples around the world have no King James Bible type bibles at all;*

the Albanian bible was destroyed during the communist regime. Many of the tribes in New Guinea do not have a bible in their language. But, these countries have no money to pay the publishers. The publishers are not interested in giving these people bibles; they are just interested in making bibles that can produce a profit for their operation."

*Wolf recommends at least four, NASV, NIV, ESV, NKJV in addition to 'the Hebrew' and 'the Greek.' See **Appendix**.

See also this preacher's experience, from this writer work *"O Biblios" – The Book* p 33 and the uploaded file p 25, www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/.

The AV1611 was not hard to understand for those converted under its preaching, when it was, allegedly, 120 years out of date:

"Two hundred miners standing in the field near the colliery at Bedworth, Warwickshire, listened with astonishment while a young Oxford graduate explained how they might have their sins forgiven. In the town of Bedworth colliers were rated heathen, animals, brutes who had no use in life other than to wrest coal from the earth. To be treated with respect and interest was a new experience. The unlicensed preacher could see "white gutters made by their tears, which plentifully fell down their black cheeks."

It was a new experience for George Whitefield as well..." [*A Treasury of Evangelical Writings* Edit. Dr. David Otis Fuller, D.D., Kregel Publications, Grand Rapids, Michigan 49501, 1980 p 291].

Note also the words of the King James translators in *The Preface to the Reader,* www.jesus-is-lord.com/pref1611.htm, this writer's emphases. Grievous Wolf has slighted both the King's men and their work.

*"...we desire that the Scripture may speak like itself, as in the language of Canaan, **that it may be understood even of the very vulgar**."*

See also the following works by Dr Mrs Gail Riplinger, available from A. V. Publications www.avpublications.com/avnew/home.html.

The Language of the King James Bible

Dr Mrs Riplinger introduces this work as follows.

***THIS NEW BOOK** reports on recent research from Harvard University which concludes that "The Authorized Version {KJV} emerges from comparison with twentieth-century versions as more attractive and more accurate." (p. 135).*

- ***"Even the secular world can spot a [counterfeiter]. The publishers of the New King James Bible (NKJV) have been charged with fraud by the Securities and Exchange Commission. They are now paying nearly $400,000 in fines (p. 127)...***

This news item from the latest issue of *The Riplinger Report, Issue #13* should also be noted.

NKJV Sold to Publisher of Satanic Bible

THE owners and publishers of the corrupt NKJV (New King James Version), Thomas Nelson Publishers, have been bought out by Rupert Murdoch's NewsCorp. and their subsidiary HarperCollins, publisher of the Satanic Bible by Anton LaVey. Now Murdoch owns the NKJV and the printing rights to the NIV, through Zondervan, which Murdoch bought in 1988! A private equity firm, Kohlberg and Company, acquired majority ownership of Nelson in 2010, setting the stage for this most recent Murdoch buyout. Now, practically every bible published in the U.S is under the control of Murdoch, a purveyer of erotica and the Satanic Bible.

The new version fraudster Grievous Wolf is in suitable company with his backing of the NKJV.

Sister Riplinger continues.

How it all began...

THE RESEARCH presented in this introduction to the language of the Bible was prompted by a story of one Christian prisoner's phenomenal leap in reading test scores, as a result of reading the King James Bible.

He was advised that he was reading at the fifth grade level when he put his name on a long waiting list to [enrol] in the prison's high school equivalency program. He then began reading the King James Bible daily. Re-examination the next year showed that he was now reading at the 17th grade level - post graduate!

How did reading one book, which some falsely claim is difficult, manage to help him, rather than frustrate him? This book answers that and many more questions you may have about the King James version.

New King James Omissions

Dr Mrs Riplinger introduces this work as follows. See extract after remarks in braces [].

[See www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/james-white-dr-divietro-and-dawaite.php, *Answers to the Wolf-Man, Question 37*.

Note that on his site, Wolf is lying about the readability of the 1611 Holy Bible. He has actually reversed the order of readability, making the 1611 Holy Bible the most difficult to read and the NIV among the easiest. Dr Mrs Riplinger has shown in *New Age Versions* Chapter 11 that the reverse is true, according to the Flesch-Kincaid Grade Level Indicator, application of which reveals that the 1611 Holy Bible is the *easiest* bible to read and the NIV *among the most difficult*. Dr Mrs Riplinger shows with numerous examples that the new versions' use of complex multi-syllable words and phrases instead the AV1611's simple one or two syllable words, in the main, make the new versions more difficult both to read and to memorize.]

WHY does the NKJV use harder words than the KJV? The derivative copyright law insists that: "To be copyrightable, a derivative work must be different enough from the original to be regarded as a 'new work' or must contain a substantial amount of new material. Making minor changes or additions of little substance to a pre-existing work will not qualify the work as a new version for copyright purposes." Therefore all new Bible versions ***must*** *change those simple one or two syllable Anglo-Saxon words to complex Latinized words. Consequently the KJV reads at the 5th grade level and the NKJV reads at the 6th grade level. Because of this copyright law, there will never be an easier to read Bible than the KJV.*

Dr Mrs Riplinger then lists numerous examples showing the harder NKJV words versus the easier KJB words, 141 in all. The list is not exhaustive. See **Table 1**.

Table 1
Hard NKJV Words versus Easy KJV Words
from *New King James Omissions*, www.avpublications.com/avnew/home.html

VERSE	HARD WORD NKJV	EASY WORD KJV
2 Cor. 3:12	we use great boldness of speech	we use great plainness of speech
Amos 5:21	savor	smell
2 Cor. 5:2	habitation	house
Eccl. 2:3	gratify	give
Is. 28:1, 4	verdant	fat
Is. 34:6	overflowing	fat
Is. 13:12	mortal	man
Deut. 28:50	elderly	old
Judges 19:29	limb	bones
Ps. 43:1	Vindicate,	Judge
Rom. 14:13	resolve	judge
Josh. 22:24	descendants	children
Heb. 7:8	mortal men	men that die
John 6:7	denarii	pennyworth
Acts 17:22	the Areopagus	Mars' Hill
Ez. 31:4	rivulets	little rivers
Joel 1:2	elders	old men
N.T.	hades	hell
1 Kings 10:28	Keveh	linen yarn
1 Sam. 13:21	pim	file
John 18:28	Praetorium	judgment hall
Eccl. 4:4	skilful	right
Rom. 13:1	governing authorities	higher powers
Gal. 5:4	estranged	no effect
Is. 2:16	sloops	pictures
Phil. 1:16, 17	The former...the latter	The one...the other
Lam. 5:3	waifs	fatherless
1 Sam.10:19	clans	thousands
Eccl. 5:1	Walk prudently	Keep thy foot
Luke 16:8	shrewdly	wisely
Jude 1:22	distinction	difference
Acts 17:5	were not persuaded	believed not
Ezra 6:1	archives	house of the rolls
Acts 27:1	Syrtis Sands	quicksands
Ps. 139:23	anxieties	thoughts
Neh. 3:7	residence	throne
Obad. 1:12	captivity	stranger
2 Cor. 11:5	eminent	chiefest
Job 2:10	adversity	evil
1 Sam. 16:14	distressing	evil
Jer. 19:3	catastrophe	evil
2 Kings 22:16	calamity	evil

Eccl. 12:1	difficult	evil
Eccl. 8:5	harmful	evil
Ezek. 5:16	terrible	evil
Ezek. 5:17	wild	evil
2 Sam. 17:14	disaster	evil
1 Kings 17:20	tragedy	evil
Prov. 16:4	doom	evil
Jer. 44:17	trouble	evil
Amos 9:4	harm	evil
Matt. 3:12	winnowing fan	fan
Matt. 5:40	tunic	coat
Matt. 10:9	moneybelts	purses
Matt. 10:10	tunics	coats
Matt. 13:47	dragnet	net
Matt. 15:29	skirted the Sea	came nigh unto the sea
Matt. 20:2	a denarius	a penny
Matt. 21:15	indignant	displeased
Matt. 23:25	self-indulgence	excess
Matt. 26:7	flask	box
Matt. 27:27	Praetorium	common hall
Matt. 27:27	garrison	band of soldiers
Mark 5:10	earnestly	much
Mark 6:8	copper in their money belts	money in their purse
Mark 6:56	marketplaces	streets
Mark 7:4	couches	tables
Mark 9:41	he will by no means	he shall not
Mark 12:44	her whole livelihood	her living
Mark 14:3	flask	box
Mark 15:45	granted	gave
Luke 5:3	multitudes	people
Luke 7:1	concluded	ended
Luke 8:31	the abyss	the deep
Luke 8:37	seized	taken
Luke 10:40	approached	came
Luke 12:14	arbitrator	divider
Luke 15:13	prodigal	riotous
Luke 15:16	stomach	belly
Luke 16:8	more shrewd	wiser
Luke 19:13	minas	pounds
Luke 19:14	delegation	message
Luke 19:43	embankment	trench
Luke 21:5	donations	gifts
Luke 24:13	were travelling	went
Luke 24:45	comprehend	understand
John 2:10	inferior	worse
John 4:12	livestock	cattle
John 9:8	previously	before

John 10:41	performed	did
John 12:6	money box	bag
John 16:29	figure of speech	proverb
John 18:3	detachment of troops	band of men
John 18:28	Praetorium	hall of judgment
John 13:22	perplexed	doubting
John 16:25	figurative language	proverbs
John 19:7	according to our law	by our law
John 19:9	Praetorium	judgment hall
John 19:23	tunic	coat
John 19:24	divided	parted
John 21:7	garment	coat
Acts 1:18	entrails	bowels
Acts 4:2	greatly disturbed	grieved
Acts 4:34	proceeds	prices
Acts 5:7	happened	done
Acts 5:14	increasingly	more
Acts 7:38	congregation	church
Acts 10:1	Regiment	band
Acts 14:5	a violent attempt	an assault
Acts 14:16	bygone generations	times past
Acts 15:9	distinction	difference
Acts 18:5	constrained	pressed
Acts 18:12	proconsul	deputy
Acts 19:21	accomplished	ended
Acts 19:23	commotion	stir
Acts 19:38	proconsuls	deputies
Acts 21:16	an early disciple	an old disciple
Acts 21:20	myriads	thousands
Acts 21:29	previously	before
Acts 21:31	garrison	band
Acts 21:34	ascertain	know
Acts 21:34	barracks	castle
Acts 21:38	insurrection	uproar
Acts 23:35	Praetorium	judgment hall
Acts 24:11	ascertain	understand
Acts 25:3	summon	send
Acts 25:20	concerning	of
Acts 25:23	auditorium	place of hearing
Acts 27:1	Regiment	band
Acts 27:21	incurred	gained
Acts 27:30	skiff	boat
Rom. 1:26	exchanged	changed
Rom. 2:5	in accordance	after
Rom. 2:27	written code	the letter
Rom. 3:25	sins that were previously committed	sins that are past

Rom. 7:7	covetousness	lust
Rom. 10:12	distinction	difference
1 Cor. 9:27	disqualified	castaway

Dr Mrs Riplinger's researches and the other material above decisively show which version is hard to understand. It is not the 1611 Holy Bible.

Wolf's Supposed 'ARCHAIC LANGUAGE' in the 1611 Holy Bible

Wolf's 'chart' of 'archaisms' in the 1611 Holy Bible is as follows, from the **Appendix**.

The number of occurrences of each word in the chart, including derivatives, has been inserted by this writer to reveal how Grievous Wolf is majoring on minors. Some errors in Wolf's original table, denoted by an asterisk * have also been included.

1. **Abject**: Psalm 35:15. **Once**	2. **Adamant**: Ezek. 3:9; Zech. 7:12. **Twice**	3. **Agone**: 1 Sam. 30:13. **Once**	4. **Alamoth**: 1 Chron. 15:20. **Once**	5. **Almug**: 1 Kings 10:11-12. **3 times**
6. **Aloes**: Prov. 7:17; John 19:39. **5 times**	7. **Ambassage**: Luke 14:32. **Once**	8.**Ambushment**: 1 Chron. 13:13*. **3 times**. *2 Chronicles 13:13.	9. **Amerce**: Deut. 22:19. **Once**	10. **Angle**: Isa. 19:8; Hab. 1:15. **Twice**
11. **Myrrh**: Gen. 37:25; Matt. 2:11. **17 times**	12. **Naught**: Prov. 20:14; 2 Kings 2:19. **9 times**	13. **Wimple**: Isa. 3:22. **Once**	14. **Wist**: Josh. 8:14; Mark 9:6. **13 times**	15. **Wit**: Gen. 24:21; Ex. 2:4; 2 Kings 10:29. **21 times, always as *"to wit"***
16 **Wizard**: Lev. 19:31; 20:27; 1 Sam. 28:3. **3 times**	17 **Wot**: Gen. 39:8; Rom. 11:2. **10 times, 11 with "wotteth"**	18. **Wreathen**: Exo. 28:14; 39:15; 2 Kings 25:27*. **10 times** *2 Kings 25:17	19. **Tache**: Exo. 26:11; 36:13, 18. **10 times**	20. **Coney**: Lev. 11:5. **4 times**

Four of the words in Wolf's chart are not 'archaisms' by his perception at all, in that they appear in the NIV, NKJV as they do in the AV1611.

"Alamoth" occurs in 1 Chronicles 15:20 in the NIV, NKJV, as in the AV1611.

"Almug" occurs 3 times in 1 Kings 10:11-12 in the NIV, NKJV, as in the AV1611.

"Aloes" occurs 5 times in the NIV, NKJV as in the AV1611.

"Myrrh" occurs 18 times in the NIV and 17 times in the NKJV.

Of the above words that occur in the AV1611 but not in either the NIV or the NKJV, ***"naught," "wist," "wit," "wot," "wreathen"*** and ***"tache"*** occur 9 times or more. This is less than half of Wolf's list and only one of the six words listed is a two-syllable word, ***"wreathen."*** Wolf's objections to 'archaisms' in the 1611 Holy Bible are trivial, as will be shown below in more detail.

Grievous Wolf insists that his chart contains only *"some examples of the many passages in the KJV Translation that are "archaic" and "outdated" for the contemporary English."* However, his charted examples should be typical of his objections to 'archaisms' in the 1611 Holy Bible, in which case, all his other such objections will be trivial too.

See www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/james-white-dr-divietro-and-dawaite.php, *Answers to the Wolf-Man, Question 13* for an overall response to Wolf's objections to the language of the 1611 Holy Bible.

In defending the KJV's use of archaic language, do you really think it is a good thing that a person must use an old English dictionary just to understand the Bible in casual reading to understand such words as "let, suffer, or hinder"; which in today's English often does not mean at all what they meant in 1611? These are only three of many other words?

Again, Wolf is displaying wilful ignorance. The 1611 Holy Bible defines its own terms e.g. consider Isaiah 32:2 for the definitions of the words ***"covert"*** and ***"tempest"*** and Mark 13:11 for the definition of the important word ***"premeditate."*** Supposed *"archaic language"* with respect to the 1611 Holy Bible is therefore another non-issue. See *The Language of the King James Bible* and *In Awe of Thy Word*, both by Dr Mrs Riplinger, for insight into the 1611 Holy Bible's own built-in dictionary. That the 1611 Holy Bible does define its own terms and these definitions are therefore independent of the vicissitudes of secular word usage is one reason why it will not pass away, according to the Lord's words in Matthew 24:35.

[***"Heaven and earth shall pass away, <u>but my words shall not pass away</u>."***]

Only rarely does the word ***"let"*** depart from contemporary usage, Romans 1:13 being an example. The context clearly indicates that Paul was hindered i.e. blocked/obstructed from visiting the Romans, according to modern usage and corresponding to 1 Thessalonians 2:18 [of the word ***"hindered"***]. The location of cross references to define Biblical terms is not a problem to anyone who obeys John 5:39 to ***"Search the scriptures."*** ***"Suffer"*** likewise often retains its contemporary usage and is defined when it has a different connotation e.g. in Matthew 19:14, where it clearly means in essence to ***"forbid not."*** The word ***"hinder"*** can obviously mean the rear part, as the embedded word *"hind"* indicates in the context and as the context also indicates in 2 Samuel 2:23, 1 Kings 7:25. It also means to block or obstruct, as above. These words can take on different meanings according to context, as is the case for many words in English, e.g. bolt, bow, fair, fast, fluke, knot, left, race, stalk etc. Such words are called homonyms, en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Homonym. Wolf is being stupid.

Wolf should also answer the question why modern *"alternates"* like *"Nephilim," "sheol," "Magi," "hades,"* "demons"** are improvements on ***"giants," "grave/hell"*** according to context, ***"wise men," "hell," "devils"*** if he thinks the 1611 Holy Bible is archaic. *Wolf raises these terms in *Question 22*, where they will be re-addressed in this work [i.e. *Answers to the Wolf-Man*].

Wolf's 'Archaisms' will be taken in turn, for the words that are not found occurring at least as often in the NIV and the NKJV that Wolf insists overcome the problem of archaisms in the AV1611 that he perceives according to his statement *"For example its* [sic] *a good idea to keep a* [sic] *old dictionary at your side when reading the KJV. Why go through the hassle, when when* [sic] *can just pick up a NIV, or NKJV and read?"* See notes under Wolf's chart with respect to Wolf's AV1611 'archaisms' that occur equally in the NIV, NKJV.

Where Dr Vance's researches are mentioned, the information will have come from his book *Archaic Words and the Authorized Version*. A reference to the dictionary meaning means *The Concise Oxford Dictionary* i.e. a modern dictionary, not *"a [sic] old dictionary."*

Abject(s): Psalm 35:15

The NIV, NKV have *"attackers."*

Dr Vance states that the word ***"abjects"*** means a degraded person, which is also the dictionary meaning. The Biblical meaning is apparent in Psalm 35:10. ***"Abjects"*** are ***"false witnesses,"*** which is about as degraded as it is possible for an individual to be. The modern alternative *"attackers"* does not convey that specific sense.

Adamant: Ezekiel 3:9, Zechariah 7:12

The NIV has *"hardest stone,"* NKV has *"adamant stone"* in Ezekiel 3:9. The NIV, NKJV have *"flint"* in Zechariah 7:12.

Dr Vance and the dictionary give the meaning of ***"adamant"*** as a mineral of extreme hardness, which is how the word is used figuratively today. Ezekiel 3:9 makes the meaning clear because it states ***"an adamant harder than flint."*** Dr Vance reveals that the word ***"adamant"*** in the Biblical sense is not archaic because it is used to describe *adamantine,* a high-melting crystalline hydrocarbon, $C_{10}H_{16}$ and to describe an adamantine drill, used for penetrating exceptionally hard substances.

Agone: 1 Samuel 30:13

The NIV, NKJV have *"ago."*

Dr Vance shows that the word ***"agone"*** derives from the Middle English verb *agon,* meaning to pass away, which is the sense of the dictionary etymological note for the word *ago*.

In this writer's view, the sense of the word ***"agone"*** is stronger than that of the word *ago* because the context of 1 Samuel 30:13 clearly refers to three days *gone*, not about to *go*.

Ambassage: Luke 14:32

The NIV, NKJV have *"delegation,"* which does not seem to this writer to be an easier word than ***"ambassage"*** at all.

However, the dictionary does not list ***"ambassage"*** but Dr Vance shows that the word is the forerunner of the modern words *ambassador* and *embassy*, the second term not being implied by *"delegation,"* which is therefore more restricted in its connotations.

Dr Vance states that the word ***"ambassage"*** means men on a mission, which is apparent from the statement in Luke 14:32 that an ***"ambassage"*** is sent ***"and desireth conditions of peace."***

Luke 14:32 in the AV1611 immediately cross-references to 2 Corinthians 5:19-20 and the parallels between the two missions are striking. *Each case* ***"desireth conditions of peace."***

"To wit, that God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them; and hath committed unto us the word of reconciliation. Now then we are ambassadors for Christ, as though God did beseech you by us: we pray you in Christ's stead, be ye reconciled to God."

The NIV, NKJV use the word *"ambassadors"* in 2 Corinthians 5:20 but their alteration of ***"ambassage"*** to *"delegation" breaks the cross reference*.

The modern alteration is therefore *inferior* to the AV1611 term ***"ambassage"*** for the *two* reasons, both given above.

Ambushment: 2 Chronicles 13:13

The NIV has *"ambush"* once and the NKJV has *"ambush"* twice.

The dictionary lists only the contemporary word *ambush* and Dr Vance states that ***"ambushment"*** is a synonym for *ambush*. He adds, however, that ***"ambushment"*** is an additional example of a word that retains both the meaning of its shortened modern equivalent and its older suffix, as in *pay – payment, command – commandment*.

Neither the word *payment* nor the word *commandment* (as in the 10 *Commandments*) is considered archaic. Neither should the word ***"ambushment"*** be considered archaic. 2 Chronicles 13:14 also shows that an ***"ambushment"*** describes a surprise attack, in that yet again, the scripture has defined its own terms.

"And when Judah looked back, behold, the battle was before and behind: and they cried unto the LORD, and the priests sounded with the trumpets."

Amerce: Deuteronomy 22:19

The NIV, NKJV have *"fine,"* which is also the dictionary meaning.

The following statements are from www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/james-white-dr-divietro-and-dawaite.php *KJO Review Full*, by this writer, p 564.

"Amerce" Deuteronomy 22:19. ***"Amerce"*** occurs only once in the AV1611. Dr Vance and the dictionary give the meaning as 'to fine.' This meaning emerges from the verse, which describes the offender as deprived of mercy, i.e. 'a-merced,' in that he is not pardoned but punished. This meaning is apparent from the preceding verse.

"And the elders of that city shall take that man and chastise him" Deuteronomy 22:18.

Dr Vance indicates that the modern versions use the term *"fine"* but adds that ***"amerce"*** remains in common legal use to this day. Note that the modern alteration of ***"amerce"*** to *"fine"* removes the meaning of 'deprived of mercy' and is therefore inferior.

Angle: Isaiah 19:8, Habakkuk 1:15

The NIV, NKJV have *"hook(s)."*

The dictionary meaning is *fishhook*, which is the meaning that Dr Vance gives for the word ***"angle,"*** from the Old English *angul*, noting that the word has a homonym in geometry and trigonometry with respect to a bend.

Dr Vance has a wry note to the effect that although the modern versions change ***"angle"*** to *"hook(s),"* a fisherman today is known as an *angler*, not a *hooker*.

Scripture with scripture, 1 Corinthians 2:13, gives the definition of the word ***"angle."***

"The fishers also shall mourn, and all they that cast angle into the brooks shall lament, and they that spread nets upon the waters shall languish" Isaiah 19:8.

"They take up all of them with the angle, they catch them in their net, and gather them in their drag: therefore they rejoice and are glad" Habakkuk 1:15.

"Notwithstanding, lest we should offend them, go thou to the sea, and cast an hook, and take up the fish that first cometh up; and when thou hast opened his mouth, thou shalt find a piece of money: that take, and give unto them for me and thee" Matthew 17:27.

Naught: 2 Kings 2:19, Proverbs 20:14 etc.

The NIV, NKJV have *"bad"* in 2 Kings 2:19 and *"no good"* and *"good for nothing"* respectively in Proverbs 20:14.

Dr Vance and the dictionary each gives the meaning of ***"naught"*** as the familiar word *"nothing,"* so the modern substitutions in the NIV, NKJV accomplish *nothing* with respect to the word ***"naught"*** in Proverbs 20:14 in the AV1611.

The word ***"naught"*** in scripture can take on the meaning ***"bad"*** and in turn the meanings ***"good for nothing"*** and even ***"evil,"*** i.e. extremely ***"bad."***

"This evil people, which refuse to hear my words, which walk in the imagination of their heart, and walk after other gods, to serve them, and to worship them, shall even be as this girdle, which is good for nothing" Jeremiah 13:10.

"One basket had very good figs, even like the figs that are first ripe: and the other basket had very naughty figs, which could not be eaten, they were so bad. Then said the LORD unto me, What seest thou, Jeremiah? And I said, Figs; the good figs, very good; and the evil, very evil, that cannot be eaten, they are so evil" Jeremiah 24:2-3.

The cross references for the word ***"naught"*** therefore show that the water of 2 Kings 2:19 was ***"bad," "good for nothing"*** and indeed ***"evil,"*** such that it caused both death and barrenness and therefore needed healing that only God could give, as 2 Kings 2:22 shows.

"And he went forth unto the spring of the waters, and cast the salt in there, and said, Thus saith the LORD, I have healed these waters; there shall not be from thence any more death or barren land."

Inspection of Jeremiah 13:10, 24:2-3 in the NIV, NKJV show that these versions break the cross references for 2 Kings 2:19, 22 and fail to convey the strength of the word ***"naught"*** in the context of 2 Kings 2:19.

Wimple: Isaiah 3:22

The NIV, NKJV have *"cloaks," "outer garments"* respectively. These terms appear to be non-inspired guesses. See remarks below.

The following statements are from www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/james-white-dr-divietro-and-dawaite.php *KJO Review Full*, by this writer, p 562.

"Wimples" Isaiah 3:22. This plural term is another that occurs only once in the AV1611 and therefore poses no serious problem for the honest reader. Dr Vance and the dictionary give the meaning as 'a covering for the head and neck,' which meaning is apparent from the associated words ***"apparel"*** and ***"mantles"*** in the verse. A ***"mantle"*** is a cloth garment that can be used to cover the face, 1 Kings 19:13.

Note that Dr Mrs Riplinger extends the meaning of the word to include *"a curl of hair"* in addition to *"a pinched fabric veil."*

Wist: Joshua 8:14, Mark 9:6 etc.

The NIV, NKJV have *"did not know"* instead of ***"wist not."***

The following statements are from www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/james-white-dr-divietro-and-dawaite.php *KJO Review Full*, by this writer, p 564.

"Wist" Acts 12:9. ***"Wot"*** is the present tense of the verb ***"wit."*** ***"Wist"*** is the past tense and therefore means 'knew.' Dr Vance and the dictionary outline the verb tenses but the expression ***"wist not"*** occurs 9 times in the AV1611, together with the phrase ***"wist ye not"*** in Luke 2:49, each occasion indicating that the meaning of the expression is 'knew not.'

[Note Acts 12:9, 11 that even with a change of tense, indicate the meaning of the term ***"wist"*** as ***"know"*** i.e. *knew*. ***"And he went out, and followed him; and wist not that it was true***

which was done by the angel; but thought he saw a vision...And when Peter was come to himself, he said, Now I know of a surety, that the Lord hath sent his angel, and hath delivered me out of the hand of Herod, and from all the expectation of the people of the Jews."]

[To] wit: Genesis 24:21, Exodus 2:4, 2 Kings 10:29 etc.

The NIV has *"learn," "see," " – "* in Genesis 24:21, Exodus 2:4, 2 Kings 10:29 respectively. The NKJV has *"know"* in Genesis 24:21, Exodus 2:4 and *"that is"* in 2 Kings 10:29.

Dr Vance and the dictionary both give the meaning of ***"to wit"*** as literally *to know* from the Old English word *witan* and as *that is to say* or *namely*, according to context e.g. as in 2 Kings 10:29.

2 Corinthians 8:1, 9 give the meaning of the word ***"wit"*** as ***"know."***

"Moreover, brethren, we do you to wit of the grace of God bestowed on the churches of Macedonia...For ye know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that, though he was rich, yet for your sakes he became poor, that ye through his poverty might be rich."

The discerning reader who obeys the Lord's command to ***"Search the scriptures"*** John 5:39 will find the meaning of the expression ***"to wit"*** as ***"namely"*** in Numbers 1:32, Joshua 17:1, 1 Chronicles 23:6, 27:1 according to the similar structure of the passages.

"Of the children of Joseph, namely, of the children of Ephraim, by their generations, after their families, by the house of their fathers, according to the number of the names, from twenty years old and upward, all that were able to go forth to war;"

"There was also a lot for the tribe of Manasseh; for he was the firstborn of Joseph; to wit, for Machir the firstborn of Manasseh, the father of Gilead: because he was a man of war, therefore he had Gilead and Bashan."

"And David divided them into courses among the sons of Levi, namely, Gershon, Kohath, and Merari."

"Now the children of Israel after their number, to wit, the chief fathers and captains of thousands and hundreds, and their officers that served the king in any matter of the courses, which came in and went out month by month throughout all the months of the year, of every course were twenty and four thousand."

The following statements are from www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/james-white-dr-divietro-and-dawaite.php *KJO Review Full*, by this writer, p 567.

"To wit" 2 Corinthians 8:1. Dr Vance states that this expression occurs 17 times in an AV1611 when used in an introductory sense, e.g. Joshua 17:1, 2 Corinthians 5:19 but affirms that it is still in common use. Its biblical usage is therefore not excessive. The dictionary and Dr Vance give the meaning of the expression in the introductory sense as 'that is to say' or 'namely.' ***"To wit"*** clearly refers to a thing that is to be known, as shown in Joshua 17:1, 1 Kings 2:32, 2 Corinthians 5:19 etc. See also comments...on ***"wot"*** and ***"wist."***

Wizard: Leviticus 19:31, 20:27, 1 Samuel 28:3

The NIV has *"spiritists"* in Leviticus 19:31, 1 Samuel 28:3 and *"spiritist"* in Leviticus 20:27.

The NKJV has *"familiar spirits"* in Leviticus 19:31, 20:27 and *"spiritists"* in 1 Samuel 28:3.

The term ***"wizard(s)"*** is always associated with ***"familiar spirit(s)"*** wherever it occurs in scripture. The word ***"wizard"*** also has a connotation with the word *wise*, which the dictionary also alludes to. The Bible believer is therefore immediately drawn to the warning in James 3:14-15.

"But if ye have bitter envying and strife in your hearts, glory not, and lie not against the truth. <u>This wisdom descendeth not from above</u>, but is <u>earthly</u>, <u>sensual</u>, <u>devilish</u>."

That is, of the world, the flesh and the Devil. That is the nature of ***"this wisdom"*** of ***"wizard(s)"*** associated with ***"familiar spirits***."

The term ***"wizard(s)"*** is therefore right up to date. It warns explicitly and especially against the likely source of superior intellect that is ungodly, see also Ezekiel 28:3, and in turn therefore against ***"philosophy and vain deceit"*** Colossians 2:8. See the *Ruckman Reference Bible* p 1269 with respect to the association between *Greek philosophers* and ***"<u>devils</u>."***

The modern versions, NIV, NKJV, break the cross reference to James 3:14-15 and obscure the scriptural warning about the potential satanic source of ***"philosophy and vain deceit"*** Colossians 2:8.

Wot: Genesis 39:8

The following statements are from www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/james-white-dr-divietro-and-dawaite.php *KJO Review Full*, by this writer, p 564.

"Wot" Romans 11:2. The expressions ***"I wot not"*** and ***"we wot not"*** appear 6 times in the AV1611 and each time the meaning 'know' or 'knows' is clear, as both the dictionary and Dr Vance confirm.

[Note that the definition of ***"wot"*** as ***"know"*** is found in Philippians 1:22, 25 ***"But if I live in the flesh, this is the fruit of my labour: yet what I shall choose <u>I wot</u> not...And having this confidence, <u>I know</u> that I shall abide and continue with you all for your furtherance and joy of faith;"***]

Wreathen: Exodus 28:14, 39:15, 2 Kings 25:17

The NIV has *"like a rope"* in Exodus 28:14, 39:15 and *"network"* in 2 Kings 25:17.

The NKJV has *"braided"* in Exodus 28:14, 39:15 and *"network"* in 2 Kings 25:17.

The dictionary likens the word *wreathe* to *writhe* or *encircle*, as with a *wreath* that Grievous Wolf does not appear to have heard of but the word is embedded in the term ***"wreathen***."

A *wreath* is made of *twisted* strands, as the dictionary also states.

Dr Vance gives a similar meaning of ***"wreathen"*** as *twist*, from the Middle English words *wrethen* and *writhen*.

Anyone who has seen a wreath (as indicated, Grievous Wolf apparently has not) would appreciate that ***"wreathen work"*** Exodus 28:14, 22, 39:15 is work of twisted strands, in this case of ***"chains of gold"*** Exodus 28:24.

It should also be noted that the expression ***"twined linen"*** occurs in Exodus 28:6, 8, 15, 39:2, 5, 8, 24, 28, 29. Dr Vance notes that the word ***"twined"*** is now perceived as archaic but he gives the meaning as *twisted*, as does the dictionary and the word ***"twined"*** is easily perceived to have this meaning. The term ***"twined"*** therefore parallels and reinforces the meaning of the word ***"wreathen"*** even if with respect to cloth rather than metal.

It should be noted further that the words ***"twined"*** and ***"wreathen"*** are also readily perceived as exalted words, like the Lord Jesus Christ is Himself exalted, Philippians 2:9, Hebrews 7:26, whereas the words *"braid"* and *"rope"* are not.

Those words are not found in the AV1611 and by comparison with the word ***"wreathen"*** they are poor substitutes.

Taches: Exodus 26:11, 36:13, 18

The NIV, NKJV have *"clasps."*

The words ***"couple"*** or ***"coupled"*** occur with ***"taches"*** in Exodus 26:6, 11, 36:13, 18, showing clearly that it is a metal fastening device.

Dr Vance gives the meaning of ***"taches"*** as fastening devices like *clasps* or *hooks* and notes that the word *tache* is associated with the word *tack.*

The dictionary gives *clasp* or *link* as the meaning of ***"tache(s)"*** and notes the association between the words *tache* and *tack*

The dictionary notes further that *tach(e)* is the embedded word in *attach* i.e. to put together and *detach* i.e. to pull apart.

The above sources show that the word ***"taches"*** has a wider range of meaning than *"clasps"* as used by the NIV, NKJV but in addition, as an embedded word in the term *attachments*, the word ***"taches"*** is clearly *more* up-to-date than any modern alternatives and by inspection *is almost literally central to the modern personal computer revolution*. Anyone who uses email is eventually almost certain to use *attachments*.

Coney: Leviticus 11:5

The AV1611 has the singular word ***"coney"*** in Leviticus 11:5, Deuteronomy 14:7 and the plural ***"conies"*** in Psalm 104:18, Proverbs 30:26.

The NIV has *"coney"* in Leviticus 11:5, Deuteronomy 14:7 and *"coneys"* in Psalm 104:18, Proverbs 30:26. *"Coney"* and *"coneys"* have each been changed to *"hyrax"* singular in the 2005TNIV, 2011NIV.

The NKJV has *"rock hyrax"* in Leviticus 11:5, Deuteronomy 14:7 and *"rock badgers"* in Psalm 104:18, Proverbs 30:26.

Both Dr Vance and the dictionary give the meaning of ***"coney"*** as *rabbit*. Dr Mrs Riplinger states in *The Language of the King James Bible* p 23 that the word ***"coney"*** is pronounced *'cunny,'* as in *'bunny,'* which, she explains, is what a ***"coney"*** is.

The NKJV's term *"rock badgers"* is clearly in error.

J. A. Moorman notes in his book *Conies, Brass and Easter*, p 5 that some critics object to the word ***"coney"*** i.e. *rabbit* as incorrect because rabbits, it is claimed, do not chew the cud, Leviticus 11:5, Deuteronomy 14:7 or inhabit rocks, Psalm 104:18, Proverbs 30:26.

Pastor Moorman states that although rabbits are not true ruminants, they partially chew their food and therefore do chew the cud as in Leviticus 11:5, Deuteronomy 14:7. He says further that hares, Leviticus 11:6, Deuteronomy 14:7, are found in the land of Israel i.e. in rocky places and that rabbits appear to have once lived there as well. Pastor Moorman adds that species of rabbits are of course found in rocky places in North America.

Note that the scripture indicates that the meaning of ***"coney"*** is *rabbit* by association of the creature with the similar animal ***"the hare"*** in Leviticus 11:6, Deuteronomy 14:7.

"And the coney, because he cheweth the cud, but divideth not the hoof; he is unclean unto you" Leviticus 11:5.

"And the hare, because he cheweth the cud, but divideth not the hoof; he is unclean unto you" Leviticus 11:6.

"Nevertheless these ye shall not eat of them that chew the cud, or of them that divide the cloven hoof; as the camel, and the hare, and the coney: for they chew the cud, but divide not the hoof; therefore they are unclean unto you" Deuteronomy 14:7.

Leviticus 11:5, 6, Deuteronomy 14:7 clearly show that ***"the coney"*** is an animal *like* ***"the hare"*** i.e. a *rabbit* to any ordinary reader.

In turn, the NIVs', TNIV's use of the word *"rabbit"* in Leviticus 11:6, Deuteronomy 14:7 is by inspection clearly *wrong*. It suggests that *"the coney"* is a *hare*, which it is *not*, only *similar to a hare*.

The modern substitutes for ***"coney"*** therefore consist of no change, 1984NIV, an obscure term less familiar even than the supposedly archaic word ***"coney,"*** 2005TNIV, 2011NIV, NKJV, an *incorrect* term, NKJV and an *incorrect* use of the word *"rabbit"* both NIVs, TNIV, none of which yields any kind of 'improvement' over the AV1611.

In sum, inspection of the above definitions shows that the NIV, NKJV substitutes provide no improvements over the AV1611, are repeatedly inferior and in four cases *unchanged* from the AV1611 terms. See remarks with respect the words ***"Alamoth," "almug," "aloes," "myrrh," "abject," "ambassage," "amerce," "angle," "coney," "naught," "taches," "wizard,"*** 12 out of Grievous Wolf's 20 examples. He clearly didn't check his sources very carefully.

Will Kinney has an excellent article on the supposed archaisms of the 1611 Holy Bible.

See brandplucked.webs.com/archaickjbship.htm and www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/ *Will Kinney's articles on the AV issue*. Extracts from Will Kinney's article follow.

The Old-fashioned Language of the King James Bible

I'm always amazed when I hear a college educated person say, "I can't understand the King James Bible with all its "thee"s, "ye"s, and other archaic words."

(To see why the use of all those "thee"s and "ye"s are far more accurate and should be retained see –

http://brandplucked.webs.com/theeandye.htm/)

In his book, Answering the Myths on the Bible Version Debate on page 91, Mr. David Cloud quotes linguistic scholar A. T. Robertson (by no means a KJB onlyist) who makes this observation about the King James Bible: "No one today speaks the English of the Authorized Version, or ever did for that matter, for though, like Shakespeare, it is pure Anglo-Saxon, yet unlike Shakespeare, IT REPRODUCES TO A REMARKABLE EXTENT THE SPIRIT AND LANGUAGE OF THE BIBLE." (A Grammar of the Greek New Testament, p. 56).

Amazing quote from the Professor of English Literature at Yale University from the Introduction to Human Nature in the Bible August 22, 1922! "But the Crowning achievement of those spacious times was the Authorised Translation of the Bible, which appeared in 1611...The art of English composition reached its climax in the pages of the Bible. When we remember that English is not a perfect language, for as a means of expression it is inferior to both Russian and Polish, it is marvellous to consider what that group of Elizabethan scholars did with it. We Anglo-Saxons have a better Bible than the

French or the Germans or the Italians or the Spanish; ***our English translation is even better than the original Hebrew and Greek. There is only way to explain this****; I have no theory ...to account for the so-called "inspiration of the Bible,"* ***but I am confident that the Authorised Version was inspired.*** *Now as* ***the English-speaking people have the best Bible in the world****, and as it is the most beautiful monument ever erected with the English alphabet, we ought to make the most of it, for it is an incomparably rich inheritance, free to all who can read. This means that* ***we ought invariably in the church and on public occasions to use the Authorised Version; all others are inferior.*** *And...it should be used exclusively in private reading.* ***Why make constant companions of the second best, when the best is available?"***

- William Lyon Phelps, Lampson Professor of English Literature at Yale 1922

A Christian lady told me about a home for retarded children here in the U.S. They tried using one of the modern bible versions for their school plays about the birth of the Saviour and His resurrection, but the kids could not remember their lines. Then they went back to the King James Bible and the kids recited their lines much more easily. The King James Bible is much easier to memorize and its words stick in the mind precisely because of the way it is written...

There is an book called, "Archaic Words and the Authorized Version", by Laurence M. Vance. In it Mr. Vance shows how most of the so-called archaic words in the KJB are not archaic at all but are found in modern magazines, newspapers, and dictionaries. There are only about 200 words usually picked out by critics of the KJB, yet of the approximately 800,000 words in the Bible this is only .004 % of the total.

He also shows many examples of words in the modern versions which most people would have to look up in a dictionary. Here are some of those words found in the "easy to read" NIV. http://www.av1611.org/kjv/vanceniv.html/ [including some that are supposedly 'archaic' AV1611 words]

abashed, abominable, abutted, acclaim, adder, adhere, admonishing, advocate, alcove, algum, allocate, allots, ally, aloes, appease, ardent, armlets, arrayed, astir, atonement, awl, banishment, battlements, behemoth, belial, bereaves, betrothed, bier, blighted, booty, brayed, breaching, breakers, buffeted, burnished, calamus, capital (not a city), carnelian, carrion, centurions, chasm, chronic, chrysolite, cistern, citadel, citron, clefts, cohorts, colonnades, complacency, coney, concession, congealed, conjure, contrite, convocations, crest, cors, curds, dandled, dappled, debauchery, decimated, deluged, denarii, depose, derides, despoil, dire, dispossess, disrepute, dissipation, distill, dissuade, divination, dragnet, dropsy, duplicity, earthenware, ebbed, ebony, emasculate, emission, encroach, enmity, enthralled, entreaty, ephod, epicurean, ewe, excrement, exodus, factions, felled, festal, fettered, figurehead, filigree, flagstaff, fomenting, forded, fowler, gadfly, galled, gird, gauntness, gecko, gloating, goiim, harrowing, haunt, herald, henna, homers, hoopoe, ignoble, impaled, implore, incur, indignant, insatiable, insolence, intact, invoked, jambs, joists, jowls, lairs, lamentation, leviathan, libations, loins, magi, manifold, maritime, mattocks, maxims, mina, misdemeanor, mother-of-pearl, mustering, myrtles, naive, naught, Negev, Nephilim, nettles, nocturnal, nomad, notorious, Nubians, oblivion, obsolete, odious, offal, omer, oracles, overweening, parapet, parchments, pavilion, peals (noun, not the verb), perjurers, perpetuate, pestilence, pinions, phylacteries, plumage, pomp, porphyry, portent, potsherd, proconsul, propriety, poultice, Praetorium, pretext, profligate, promiscuity, provincial, providence, qualm, quarries, quivers (noun, not verb), ramparts, ransacked, ratified, ravish, rabble, rawboned, relish (not for hot dogs), recoils, recount, refrain, relent, rend, reposes, reprimanded, reputed, retinue, retorted, retribution, rifts, roebucks, rue, sachet, satraps, sated, shipwrights, siegeworks, sinews, sistrums, sledges, smelted, somber, soothsayer,

sovereignty, spelt, stadia, stench, stipulation, sullen, tamarisk, tanner, temperate, tether, tetrarch, terebinth, thresher, throes, thronged, tiaras, tinder, tracts, transcends, tresses, turbulent, tyrannical, unscathed, unrelenting, usury, vassal, vaunts, vehemently, verdant, vexed, wadi, wanton, warranted, wield, winnowing and wrenched.

There are many cases where the NIV uses a harder word than the KJB. Compare the following: The NIV has "abasement" in Ezra 9:5 whereas the KJB has "heaviness." Isaiah 24:23: "abashed" (NIV) = "confounded" (KJB). Ezekiel 40:18: "abutted" (NIV) = "over against" (KJB). 2 Chronicles 15:14: "acclamation" (NIV) = "voice" (KJB). Isaiah 13:8: "aghast" (NIV) = "amazed" (KJB) Psalm 107:5 "ebbed away" (NIV) = "fainted" (KJB). A personal favorite is "squall" (NIV) instead of "storm" (KJB) in Mark 4:37.

It is funny that I can put together the phrase from the KJB which says; "The very sad green giant was hungry" and in the NIV it would be: "The overweening dejected verdant Nephilim was famished."

Well, how about the New KJV? Can you pass this vocabulary test even with a few of my "helpful hints"? Let's see.

The vocabulary of the New King James Version, [including some words that are supposedly 'archaic' AV1611 words] ***along with some "helpful hints"*** [much appreciated]

Abase, abashed, abode, adhere, admonish, adversity, aground, algum, alienate, alighting, allays, allotment, alloy, aloof, alms, amend, amiss, annihilated, anise, antitype, arbitrate, apprehended, archives, armlets, ascertain, asps, attire, austere, backbite, banishment, baths (not to get clean), bdellium, befalls, beggarly, begetting, behemoth, belial, beseech, betrothal, beveled, birthstools, bittern, bleat, booty (not modern slang), borne, breach, brandished (not drunk), bray, bristling, buffet (not a restaurant), buckler (not a belt), bulrush, (not a stampede), burnished, buttress (not a chair), calamus, caldron, capital (not a city), carcasses, carnally, carrion (not luggage), cassia, caulkers, centurion (not a 100 years), chalcedony, chalkstones, chaste (not pursued by a runner), chasten, (not related to previous chaste), chrysolite, chrysoprase, circumspect, cistern (not feminine of brethren), citadel, citron, clamor, cleft, cloven (not a spice), commission (not money), commonwealth (not shared money), compound (not a barracks), concede , compulsory, conciliation, concubine (not a tractor), congealed, contemptuously, confederacy (not the South), contingents (not same as large land masses), corban, coriander, countenance (not adding up ants), couriers (not an hordourve), covert, crags, crescents, crest (not the top of a hill), cropped (not food), cubit, custodian (not the one who cleans the school halls), curds, dainties (not effeminate), dandled, daubed, dappled, dayspring, denarii, deposed (not relaxing after a foto op), deride (not same as dismount), despoiled (not really, really rotten), diadem, diffuses (not to disarm a bomb), dilapidation (not the act of standing up), dispensation, disrepute, dissipation, diviner (not a grape grower), docile, dragnet (not a detective drama), dregs, drachmas, dropsy (not clumsiness), dross, dryshod, eczema (God bless you), edict, edification, elaborate, embellish, emitted, enigma, enmity, entrails (not a short cut), envoy, eventide, epistle, ephod, exorcise (not jogging), expiration (not a date on a carton of milk), faction, fallow, famish, fare (not average and not money), fatlings (not piglets), feigned (not passed out), festal, fetched, fidelity (not good sound), figurehead (not a statue of a head), filly, flanges, foreskin, fostered, fowlers (not a baseball term), fuller (not less empty), furlongs (not cat tails), gad, garland, garrison, gaunt, gecko, graven, Hellenists, hew (not a man's name), homers (not baseball), hoopoe (not a garden tool), immutability, indignant, insolence, insubordination, intervene, itinerant, jackdaw, jeopardy (a TV show, but what does it mean?), jubilation, kors (not a brand of beer), laden, lamentations, laud (not Boston pronunciation of lard), lusty, mail (not a letter), mammon, matrix (other than the movie), mattock (not a TV lawyer show),

mercenaries, mina (not a type of bird), mite (not a bed bug), moorings, nativity, offal (not terrible), offscouring (not dandruff), omnipotent, onager (Job 39:5 - you won't believe this one!) oracle, pangs, papyrus (not a fruit), paramours, parapet (not a dog and a cat), penitents, perdition, phylacteries, pilfering, pillage, pims, pins (not like needles or bowling-has to do with a chariot), pinions (not a type of nut), plaited (not dishes), platitudes, potentate, potsherd, poultice (not chickens), Praetorium (not a place to pray), prattler, principality, prodigal, proconsul, prognosticators (not people who put things off till later), propitiation, psaltery, prow, pulverize, pyre, quadrans, quiver (not to shake), rampart (not a piece of a truck), ravenous, ravished, raze (not to lift up), reconciliation, recount (not to double check your arithmetic), rend, renown, reprisal, retinue, rifled (does not have to do with guns), rivulets, rogue, salute (does not have to do with the army), satiate, satraps, scruples, sepulcher, shamefaced, shards, Sheol, shod, shuttle (not a type of bus or spaceship), siegeworks, sistrums (not an affectionate term for your sisters), skiff, soothsayer, spelt (not anything to do with spelling words), straits (not the opposite of crookeds), superfluous, supplanted, tamarisk, tares, tarries, temperate, terebinth, terrestrial, tetrarch, throng (not a skimpy bathing suit), timbrel, tittle (not the name of a book), tresses, usury, vagabond, vassal, vehement, vermilion, verdure, verity, vestments, waifs, wane, wanton (not desiring something), warp (not to bend), wend, wield, winebibber, woof (not a dog or stereo), wrought.

Harder Words in the NKJV (provided by Sam Gipp)

[The original list omits Mark 5:10, so that the definitions from Luke 7:1 to Acts 5:7 are displaced by one line in the original list. The correct order follows, with the insertion of the definitions with respect to Acts 5:7. Note that Deuteronomy 15:1, Acts 27:21 in the original list should be Deuteronomy 14:7, Acts 27:17.]

Reference_____AV 1611_____NKJV

Gen 9:9_____seed_____decendants

Gen. 18:1_____plains_____terebinth trees

Gen. 35:4_____oak_____terebinth tree

Lev. 4:11_____dung_____offal

Dt. 14:7_____coney_____rock hyrax

Dt. 28:50_____old_____elderly

Josh. 22:24_____children_____decendants

Jud. 8:13_____sun was up_____Ascent of Heres

Ruth 4:5_____raise up_____perpetuate

1Sam. 13:21_____file_____pim

1Sam. 16:16_____evil_____distressing

1Sam. 22:6_____tree_____tamanisk tree

2Sam. 6:5_____cornet_____sistrums

1Kg. 10:2_____train_____retinue

2Kg. 12:5_____breach_____dilapidation

Eccl. 2.3_____give_____gratify

Isa. 13:12_____man_____mortal

Isa. 28:1, 4_____fat_____verdant

Isa. 34:14_____screech owl_____night creature

Jer. 19:3_____evil_____catastrophe

Jer. 36:6_____mouth_____instructions

Dan. 1:17_____learning_____literature

Dan. 6:2_____princes_____satraps

Hos. 4:13_____elms_____terebinths

Matt. 21:15_____[sore] displeased_____indignant

Matt. 23:25_____excess_____self-indulgence

Mark 5:10_____much_____earnestly

Luke 7:1_____ended_____concluded

Luke 8:31_____the deep_____the abyss

Luke 12:14_____divider_____arbitrator

Luke 21:5_____gifts_____donations

John 2:10_____worse_____inferior

John 4:12_____cattle_____livestock

John 9:8_____before_____previously

John 10:41_____did_____performed

Acts 5:7_____done_____happened

Acts 5:14_____more_____increasingly

Acts 10:1_____band_____Regiment

Acts 27:17_____quicksands_____Syrtis sands

Rom. 10:12_____difference_____distinction

2Cor. 5:2_____house_____habitation

Titus 1:6_____riot_____dissipation

Titus 1:6_____unruly_____insubordination

So you see, besides the very serious textual matter, the modern versions also have words hard to be understood. Try giving this list of words as a vocabulary test and see if your son or daughter, or even yourself gets a passing score.

There is a huge battle going on today about the Bible. We are headed for the falling away, the apostasy, which will occur before the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ in glory and judgment. This is the most biblically ignorant generation of Americans ever, in spite of, or perhaps, BECAUSE OF the modern versions.

The explosion of multiple-choice, conflicting modern versions has encouraged the student to pick and choose his own preferred readings and has created a tendency to treat every Bible lightly and to look upon none as the final words of God.

I believe the KJB to be God's preserved, complete, pure, and inspired words. If I have to choose between a modern, up-to-date language Bible version that omits thousands of God inspired words from the New Testament (as do the NASB, NIV, ESV, Holman), that rejects the Hebrew readings in numerous places, and that teaches false doctrine in several verses, or choose the old King James Bible that has a few "archaic words" but teaches the whole truth of God in purity of doctrine, it is a no-brainer. I will gladly and thankfully take the Holy Bible that God has set His mark of approval on like no other - the King James Bible. If you don't have one, get it, read it, believe it, memorize it and hid its words in your heart.

The Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ said in Matthew 24:35, "Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away."

The Bible itself is not meant to be a book which can be easily understood. Who can read through the minor prophets and not ask himself: "What is he talking about? What does this mean?" Yet there are many parts of the Bible that even a child can comprehend.

I do not believe the Bible is supposed to be translated into contemporary street language. The English of the KJB 1611 was not written in "street language" even at that time.

According to Oxford University, and the PBS series 'The History of English':

William Shakespeare used a total vocabulary of just over 24,000 words. In 2003 16,000 of those words are "obsolete".

Edgar Allen Poe used a total vocabulary of under 18,000 words. In 2003 9,550 of those words are "obsolete".

The King James Bible contains a total vocabulary of just over 6,000 words. In 2003 approximately 8 of those words are "obsolete"...

The King James Bible reads differently from any other book. It is not like a newspaper, nor is it meant to sound like one. The Bible is an ancient book filled with timeless wisdom. I am impressed by the fact that this King James Bible has been around for a long time; it reads differently than any other book; it speaks like no man does in the pulpit, on radio or television, and I have to think about what it is saying. I don't just breeze through it like a tabloid magazine. When I slow down to think about what it says, I find that God speaks to me.

There seem to be two attitudes towards the KJB - those who want to understand it and defend it, and those who want to criticize and attack it.

To illustrate some of the confusion being wrought today by the conflicting "bibles" let me give you a few examples from the modern versions. In Job 42:6 the KJB along with the RV, ASV, NKJV, NIV, and ESV says: "Wherefore I ABHOR MYSELF and repent in dust and ashes". The NASB says, "Therefore I RETRACT, and I repent in dust and ashes." The Holman CSB says: "Therefore I TAKE BACK MY WORDS, and repent..." There is a big difference between [abhorring] myself and "taking back what I said".

In Exodus 26:14, "Thou shalt make a covering for the tent of rams' skins dyed red, and a covering of BADGERS' skins". The NKJV, Geneva, Darby, Young's, Webster's, KJB 21, Third Millennium Bible, Rotherham's Emphatic Bible, and the Spanish all agree with the KJB. The NASB has "PORPOISE skins" while the NIV has "SEA COWS". The RSV and the 2001 ESV both have "GOATSKINS". The Holman says: "MANATEE SKINS". In the wilderness, badgers' skins would be [difficult] to come by, but how many porpoises (NASB) or sea cows (NIV), or manatees (Holman) do you think they could have scrounged up?

In Exodus 14:25, The LORD troubled the host of the pursuing Egyptians and "TOOK OFF" their chariot wheels. The RV, ASV, NIV, NKJV all equal the KJB, but the NASB and Holman tells us, "He caused the chariot wheels TO SWERVE". My car wheels have at times swerved but they didn't come off. Not quite the same meaning, is it? The RSV and ESV say: "CLOGGING their chariot wheels" with a footnote that tells us "clogging" comes from the LXX and the Syriac, but the Hebrew says "removing", like the KJB has.

In Deut. 33:25, "As thy days, so shall thy STRENGTH be." No matter what difficulties I may encounter, God will give me the strength to bear them and to go on. The NIV, NKJV, ASV, Geneva, [Young's], Holman, and Spanish all agree with the KJB. The NASB has: "And according to your days, so shall YOUR LEISURELY WALK be." Did God ever promise us a leisurely walk? Not if I read the rest of the Bible, He didn't.

Is there a difference between an eagle and a vulture? In Matt. 24:28, "For wheresoever the carcass is, there will the EAGLES be gathered together." The RV, ASV, NKJV, Darby, Young, RSV, and Spanish all agree with the KJB. The NIV, ESV, Holman, and NASB have "vultures", yet it is a quote from Job 39:27-30 where it refers to eagles, even in the NIV, ESV, Holman, and NASB! The NIV, ESV, Holman, and NASB translate this same word as eagles in Rev. 4:7 and 12:14.

If someone said our national bird were the vulture, I think Americans would be a little upset; yet the NIV, Holman, ESV, and NASB think nothing of changing the eternal word of God, and few Christians seem to mind at all...

Those who don't believe any Bible, and more particularly the KJB, is the inspired word of God, frequently criticize the KJB for using words like "to let, prevent, suffer, and conversation". This is a bait and switch tactic, a smokescreen, and a poor excuse to get us to switch to a modern bible version which differs from the KJB both in text and meaning in hundreds of verses.

The verb "to let" is used in three ways in the KJB. "Let them alone, they be blind leaders of the blind." "planted a vineyard...and let it out to husbandmen." The third example is the archaic use of to let meaning to withhold or to hinder.

There are still traces of this meaning today. Webster's defines the noun "a let" as an obstacle, a hindrance, or a delay. In tennis if a ball hits the net, it is called a let ball. In 2 Thessalonians 2:6-7, "And now ye know what withholdeth that he might be revealed in his time. For the mystery of iniquity doth already work: only he who now letteth, will let, until he be taken out of the way."

A fellow KJB believer writes: "Some words that are deemed archaic are actually still used frequently by some segment of the population as terms of art. For example, "let" (Romans 1:13) is considered to be a prime example of an archaic word in the KJV ("let" in this usage means "hindered"). However, the term "without let or hindrance" is used in the passport notes of Britain, Canada, Australia, South Africa, Nigeria, India, Pakistan, and Israel. Thus people who work with immigration, such as border guards, lawyers, policy makers, and many educated people are familiar with the term "without let or hindrance." This makes "let" at most a bit of jargon rather than an archaism. Also, anybody who plays or watches tennis will know that a "let" is called when a stroke does not count and hinders the gameplay (including when it hits/is hindered by the net and lands in the correct service box). Thus a word such as "let" may be infrequently used today, but it is not entirely obsolete."

Not only does the KJB use the word "let" in the sense of to hinder or withhold, but so also do Coverdale 1535, [Bishops'] Bible 1568, and the Geneva Bible 1599 has "will let" in the second part of the verse. Even the Revised Version uses "to let" in this sense in Isaiah 43:13.

What I mean by bait and switch is the new versions say in effect "Let us clear up the confusion of the KJB and give you a modern rendering." But look at the NKJV, NIV, and NAS. They have updated the word "let" but all three have introduced a private interpretation into the passage by capitalizing certain words and not others (NKJV and NAS), or by adding words not found in any text (NIV).

The NKJV says, "And now you know what is restraining, that he may be revealed in his own time. For the mystery of lawlessness is already at work; only He who now restrains will do so until He is taken out of the way." Do you see how they have capitalized some of the "He"s and not others? They are forcing you to look at the passage in a certain way to understand its meaning. Yet there is a totally different way of looking at the passage, which is obscured by the new versions...

A Recent Letter from a native foreign language speaker regarding the King James Bible -

In August of 2010 at our Which Version club we received this post from non-native English speaker. He writes:

"I am an immigrant from the Far East. English is my third language, Taiwanese dialect was the "home language" and Mandarin was the "national" language. I came to the US when I was 12 years old. Language is not one of my natural gifts, I really am stink at English vocabulary and grammar, my Mandarin is really rusty, and I can only understand some Taiwanese but can't get to say anything intelligent.

I grew up using the NIV as a born again Christian not knowing anything about manuscript issues. About 12 years after I was saved, a pastor showed me Acts 8:37 which my NIV bible didn't have. Soon after that I switched to KJV.

It was hard in the beginning to read a new Bible for sure. I constantly asked my pastor what this and that means. The break-in period for me was about three months til I got more comfortable and I was reading many chapters a day to get there. Sure it was hard, but to me since it was God's only preserved word in English, I didn't complain. It's not about my personal preference. I want to glorify God by studying the Bible he kept for me to read. Many died and shed their blood for this Bible and I cherish it with all my heart. If God can teach someone like me to read and understand this Book, he can teach anyone. This "archaic issue" is only an excuse.

Tim

Another Letter -

Soon after-wards, another non-native English speaker posted this response -

Tim, Like you, English is not my mother tongue. I speak some Chinese dialects like Cantonese, Hokkien and Mandarin is the mother tongue we learn in school. English is the official language taught in school and Malay is our national language.

I don't have problem reading the King James Bible. Neither my wife nor our children who have been reading the Bible when they are able to read at a young age. Shame on those [who] are brought up in the English speaking environment, especially those whose mother tongue is English, who claim that the King James Bible is archaic and hard to read and understand.

I have given up reasoning with those who major in infidelity giving all sorts of excuses accusing God for failing to preserve His words for us. They don't hold to any Bible to be perfect, inerrant and infallible to begin with and why should I waste time with them. They keep shifting goal posts when you deal with them on Scriptures. If they are saved, they can

argue with God at the judgment seat of Christ for all I care. Notwithstanding, I thank God for those who take a stand for the Holy Bible whose patience have not yet been exhausted dealing with critics of the Bible. Glad you are one of those whose eyes the Lord mercifully opens to behold great and wondrous things out of His law.

Psalm 119:97: O how love I thy law! it is my meditation all the day.

98: Thou through thy commandments hast made me wiser than mine enemies: for they are ever with me.

99: I have more understanding than all my teachers: for thy testimonies are my meditation.

100: I understand more than the ancients, because I keep thy precepts.

Proverbs 14:6: A scorner seeketh wisdom, and findeth it not: but knowledge is easy unto him that understandeth.

I suppose fools will claim that the above verses are archaic and hard to read and understand. I know I sound archaic to Bible infidels. Really I could care less.

Charles

Will Kinney

Footnote: There is also a very good article about the language of the King James Bible found at the King James Version site.

You can see it here:

http://sites.google.com/site/kjvtoday/home/language-of-the-kjv

And another one titled Why the English of the King James Bible is Better than that of all Modern Versions by James H. Sightler here:

http://www.sightlerpublications.com/bible/WhyTheEnglishOfTheKingJamesBible.htm?mid=516

And another one by Dr. Ken Matto, called The Language of the King James Bible - An Excuse. It can be seen here: http://www.scionofzion.com/kj_language.htm

The material from Sister Riplinger, Will Kinney, Sam Gipp and Dr Vance shows that Grievous Wolf will not be able to dispense with a dictionary even though he discards the 1611 Holy Bible in favour of any of the modern substitutes.

Conclusion

Grievous Wolf should take careful note of two statements in particular from the above correspondence. So should many a fundamentalist modern version supporter. This work concludes with the following citations from these overseas brothers, which really sum up this whole work.

From Tim:

It's not about my personal preference.

From Charles:

Shame on those [who] are brought up in the English speaking environment, especially those whose mother tongue is English, who claim that the King James Bible is archaic and hard to read and understand.

Amen to both.

Appendix – Grievous Wolf's 'Corrections' to the 1611 Holy Bible

See www.cerm.info/bible_studies/Exegetical/king_james_onlyism.htm.

MISTRANSLATED VERSES & ARCHAIC LANGUAGE

Some of the other arguments against KJV onylism are mistranslated verses to archaic language. The chart below shows a few verses that have been incorrectly translated in the KJV.

KJV translates…	Textus Receptus actually says…
"robbers of churches." Acts 19:37	Every known Greek manuscript has HIEROSULOUS, "robbers of temples"
"Lucifer" Is 14:12	"O Day Star" (Lucifer is a human origin nickname for the Devil in the 1600's refers not to the devil but the king of Babylon)
"Easter" Acts 12:4	"Passover"(Easter very poor choice as it confuses the pagan origin Roman Catholic "Easter" holy day with what the TR clearly says is the Jewish Passover!)
"Baptism" (entire New Testament) Acts 2:38; 22:16	immersion, because sprinkling was the mode of baptism in 1611AD, they jelly-fished out and transliterated the Greek "baptizo" but refused to translate it.
"Tithes of all I possess" Lk 18:12	"all I acquire" (Not only variant with the TR, but quite wrong. Tithes were never paid on capital, only increase)
"Schoolmaster" Gal 3:24	"attendant" (the law was the one who brought us to Christ, not taught us about Christ)
"God save the King": 1Sam 10:24, 2Sam 16:16, 1Kings 1:25	"May the king live" ("God" not in TR, but reflects the British culture of the 1600's. Proof that the translators used dynamic equivalents.)
"God Forbid." Ro. 3:4,6,31; 6:2,15; 7:7,13; 9:14; 11:1,11; 1 Co. 6:15; Ga. 2:17; 3:21; 6:14	"may it not be" or "let it not be." (KJV adds the word God where it is absent in the TR because it was a common expression in 1600's. Proof that the translators used dynamic equivalents.)
"sweet savour" Lev 6:21; 8:28; 17:6; 23:18	"soothing aroma" (KJV appeals to wrong senses- taste instead of smell in the TR)
"ashes upon his face" 1 Kings 20:38	"bandage over his eyes" (KJV varies from TR by using ashes)

Chart from www.bible.ca/b-kjv-only.htm*

Here are some other verses that have been incorrectly translated in the KJV and have been updated in the NKJV.

*The original chart from the above site is shown at the end of the appendix.

PASSAGE #1

Exodus 32:14 (KJV) [14]And the LORD **repented of the evil** which he thought to do unto his people.

Exodus 32:14 (NKJV) [14]So the Lord **relented** from the harm which He said He would do to His people.

PASSAGE #2

Amos 7:6 (KJV) [6]The LORD **repented for this**: This also shall not be, saith the Lord GOD.

Amos 7:6 (NKJV) So the Lord **relented** concerning this. "This also shall not be," said the Lord GOD.

PASSAGE #3

Jonah 3:10 (KJV) [10]And God saw their works, that they turned from their evil way; and **God repented of the evil**, that he had said that he would do unto them; and he did *it* not.

Jonah 3:10 (NKJV) [10]Then God saw their works, that they turned from their evil way; and God **relented** from the disaster that He had said He would bring upon them, and He did not do it.

PASSAGE #4

Jeremiah 18:7-10 (KJV) [7]*At what* instant I shall speak concerning a nation, and concerning a kingdom, to pluck up, and to pull down, and to destroy *it*; [8]If that nation, against whom I have pronounced, turn from their evil, I will **repent of the evil** that I thought to do unto them. [9]And *at what* instant I shall speak concerning a nation, and concerning a kingdom, to build and to plant *it*; [10]If it do evil in my sight, that it obey not my voice, then I will **repent of the good**, wherewith I said I would benefit them.

Jeremiah 18:7-10 (NKJV) [7]The instant I speak concerning a nation and concerning a kingdom, to pluck up, to pull down, and to destroy *it*, [8]if that nation against whom I have spoken turns from its evil, I will **relent** of the disaster that I thought to bring upon it. [9]And the instant I speak concerning a nation and concerning a kingdom, to build and to plant *it* ,[10]if it does evil in My sight so that it does not obey My voice, then I will **relent** concerning the good with which I said I would benefit it.

All other translations in my possession use the word **relent** instead of Repent. The word **relented** does not mean that God changed his mind, rather it means that God changed his behavior to remain consistent with his nature. When God first wanted to destroy the people, he was acting with his mercy. God told His people on many occasions that if they changed their ways, He would not condemn them. They did change, and so God did as he promised (Life application Study Bible Notes).

The KJV's use of the word Repent in this and many other passages is an incorrect translation and why the modern versions use the word **relent** instead.

PASSAGE #5

Exodus 20:13 (KJV) Thou shalt not kill.

Exodus 20:13 (NKJV) "You shall not murder.

The Authorized Version mistranslates the Hebrew word **Ratsach**. This Hebrew word is defined below.

Ratsach- To murder, slay-killed(1), kills the manslayer, manslayer(18), murderd [sic] **(2), murderer(12), murderer shall be put(1), murderers(1), murders(1), put to death(1), slew(1).**

Looking at Ex 20:13 in the King James Version and one could come up with a number of different conclusions. For example one could imply that God has forbidden that man kill animals, insects, etc. Such a conclusion seems absurd, but there are groups out there that do interpret the Bible literally here. There are many 7th day Adventists that believe that God has ordained all of his sons to be Vegetarians. This verse in Exodus is one such verse of many that they use to conclude that Vegetarianism is the way of the Lord. Vegetarianism is not what God wants for his people, for if it was, why would He tell Peter to kill the animals and eat in Acts 19:9-16? There is a reason why God gave us animals, and he did so that we can eat them. One of the dangers of using only the KJV and not looking at the original languages, is that it's so easy to mistranslate verses and misinterpret the Biblical text. The Bible does not forbid killing animals for food, nor does it forbid killing insects. Sadly there are many well intended KJV Only Christians that have been blinded into thinking that the KJV is superior to the original language in which their translation was copied. **<u>These people</u>**

worship a translation, and not the God that wrote the Bible. Those serious about studying God's word will own more than just a KJV. They will own multiple translations. The easiest and perhaps the most cost effective way to own multiple translations is to purchase computer Bible software. **E-Sword** for Windows is free of charge, and possibly the easiest to use and most powerful software for Windows, outside of **Logos**. Unfortunately **logos** has a very large price tag. For the Mac I would recommend both **Accordance** or **QuickVerse.** Unfortunately **E-Sword** does not exist for the Mac, so I cant [sic] recommend any free of charge software titles for Mac users.

ARCHAIC LANGUAGE

Below are some examples of the many passages in the KJV Translation that are "archaic" and "outdated" for the contemporary English. I am not saying that the King James Version has been mistranslated below, what I am saying is that the usage of the terms below in the current vernacular is outdated and archaic. This does not mean that the King James is wrong, but what is does mean, is that contemporary audiences will have a hard time comprehending the KJV. This is why God allowed the **New King James**, the **New International Version**, the **English Standard Version** and the **New American Standard Version**, among others to be translated. People can be trained to understand the KJV, but this usually requires a great deal of effort and resources. For example its [sic] a good idea to keep a [sic] old dictionary at your side when reading the KJV. Why go through the hassle, when when [sic] can just pick up a NIV, or NKJV and read?

The gospel is available to all mankind, and a KJVO gospel limits the gospel only to the "well educated."

1. **Abject**: Psalm 35:15.	2. **Adamant**: Ezek. 3:9; Zech. 7:12.	3. **Agone**: 1 Sam. 30:13.	4. **Alamoth**: 1 Chron. 15:20.	5. **Almug**: 1 Kings 10:11-12.
6. **Aloes**: Prov. 7:17; John 19:39.	7. **Ambassage**: Luke 14:32.	8.**Ambushment**: 1 Chron. 13:13	9. **Amerce**: Deut. 22:19.	10. **Angle**: Isa. 19:8; Hab. 1:15.
11. **Myrrh**: Gen. 37:25; Matt. 2:11.	12. **Naught**: Prov. 20:14; 2 Kings 2:19.	13. **Wimple**: Isa. 3:22	14. **Wist**: Josh. 8:14; Mark 9:6	15. **Wit**: Gen. 24:21; Ex. 2:4; 2 Kings 10:29
16 **Wizard**: Lev. 19:31; 20:27; 1 Sam. 28:3	17 **Wot**: Gen. 39:8; Rom. 11:2	18. **Wreathen**: Exo. 28:14; 39:15; 2 Kings 25:27	19. **Tache**: Exo. 26,11; 36:13, 18	20. **Coney**: Lev. 11:5.

The chart above is not including the many passages of scripture that contain mythological animals.

Unicorn

Numbers 23:22 (KJV) [22]God brought them out of Egypt; he hath as it were the strength of an **unicorn**.

Numbers 24:8 (KJV) [8]God brought him forth out of Egypt; he hath as it were the strength of an **unicorn**: he shall eat up the nations his enemies, and shall break their bones, and pierce *them* through with his arrows.

Job 39:9 (KJV) [9]Will the **unicorn** be willing to serve thee, or abide by thy crib?

The NKJV seems to have replaced the archaic word "unicorn" with "Wild OX."

Satyrs

Isaiah 13:21 (KJV) [21]But wild beasts of the desert shall lie there; and their houses shall be full of doleful creatures; and owls shall dwell there, and **satyrs** shall dance there.

The NKJV replaces "Satyrs" with "Wild Goats."

Below is another example of the archaic language in the KJV Translation. I think that this verse is very important, as its usage is very restricted in today's society and usually only has a negative connotation when you hear this word these days.

James 2:3 (KJV) [3]And ye have respect to him that weareth the **gay clothing**, and say unto him, Sit thou here in a good place; and say to the poor, Stand thou there, or sit here under my footstool:

James 2:3 (NKJV) [3]and you pay attention to the one wearing the **fine clothes** and say to him, "You sit here in a good place," and say to the poor man, "You stand there," or, "Sit here at my footstool,"

The original chart from the site www.bible.ca/b-kjv-only.htm follows. Note that Grievous Wolf missed out the row with the ***"flagon"*** 2 Samuel 6:19; 1 Chronicles 16:3; Song of Solomon 2:5; Hosea 3:1.

Errors where the KJV translation disagrees with the Textus Receptus:

KJV translates...	**Textus Receptus actually says...**
"robbers of churches" Acts 19:37	Every known Greek manuscript has HIEROSULOUS, "robbers of temples"
"Lucifer" Is 14:12	"O Day Star" (Lucifer is a human origin nickname for the Devil in the 1600's refers not to the devil but the king of Babylon)
"Easter" Acts 12:4	"Passover"(Easter very poor choice as it confuses the pagan origin Roman Catholic "Easter" holy day with what the TR clearly says is the Jewish Passover!)
"Baptism" (entire New Testament) Acts 2:38; 22:16	immersion, because sprinkling was the mode of baptism in 1611AD, they jelly-fished out and transliterated the Greek "baptizo" but refused to translate it.
"Tithes of all I possess" Lk 18:12	"all I acquire" (Not only variant with the TR, but quite wrong. Tithes were never paid on capital, only increase)
"Schoolmaster" Gal 3:24	"attendant" (the law was the one who brought us to Christ, not taught us about Christ)
"God save the King" 1Sam 10:24, 2Sam 16:16, 1Kings 1:25	"May the king live" ("God" not in TR, but reflects the British culture of the 1600's. Proof that the translators used dynamic equivalents.)
"God Forbid" Ro. 3:4,6,31; 6:2,15; 7:7,13; 9:14; 11:1,11; 1 Co. 6:15; Ga. 2:17; 3:21; 6:14	"may it not be" or "let it not be." (KJV adds the word God where it is absent in the TR because it was a common expression in 1600's. Proof that the translators used dynamic equivalents.)
"sweet savour" Lev 6:21; 8:28; 17:6; 23:18	"soothing aroma" (KJV appeals to wrong senses - taste instead of smell in the TR)
"ashes upon his face" 1 Kings 20:38	"bandage over his eyes" (KJV varies from TR by using ashes)
"flagon" 2 Sam 6:19; 1 Chron 16:3; SoS 2:5; Hosea 3:1	These verses contain the word "flagon" which is a fluted cup from which liquid is drunk. However, the Hebrew word is "ashishah" which has always meant raisins or raisin cakes. This is especially true in Hos 3:1 because raisin cakes were often offered to idols. This is an obvious error in translation.

References

[1] *Which Bible is God's Word?* by Gail Riplinger, A.V. Publications, 2007, p 116

[2] *Bible Believers Bulletin*, September 1995-March 1996. The September and December 1995 issues carried the details of Dr Ruckman's response to White's challenge. See also www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/james-white-dr-divietro-and-dawaite.php*, James White's 7 Errors.*

See also the *Ruckman Reference Bible* p 1468.

[3] *New Age Versions* pp 42-43. See:

"O Biblios" – The Book p 316, uploaded file p 247, www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/

KJO Review Full www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/james-white-dr-divietro-and-dawaite.php pp 272-273

[4] samgipp.com/answerbook/?page=02.htm, *The Answer Book* by Dr Samuel C. Gipp, Th.D., www.daystarpublishing.org/ Daystar Publishing, 1989

[5] www.sovereignword.org/index.php/defense-of-the-traditional-bible-texts-and-kjb/213-dr-thomas-hollands-manuscript-evidence-class-lesson-11.

[6] *Conies, Brass and Easter* by J.A. Moorman, B.F.T. #1737 The Bible for Today, pp 13-15

[7] *KJO Review Full* www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/james-white-dr-divietro-and-dawaite.php pp 542ff

[8] www.holybible.com/resources/Trinitarian/article_43.htm

[9] *KJO Review Full* www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/james-white-dr-divietro-and-dawaite.php p 495

[10] *"O Biblios" – The Book* pp 167-168, uploaded file pp 128-129, www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/